

The Anatomy of Tobacco:

OR

Smoking

METHODISED, DIVIDED, AND CONSIDERED AFTER A NEW FASHION.

"Vast bodies of philosophy."—ABRAHAM COWLEY.
"Si quis in hoc artem populo non novit *fumandi*
Me legat."—OVID. Artis Amatoriæ, I. 1.

BY

LEOLINUS SILURIENSIS,

PROFESSOR OF FUMIFICAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BRENTFORD.

IMPRINTED FOR GEORGE REDWAY, AND TO BE SOLD BY HIM AT HIS SHOP IN YORK STREET, NEAR TO COVENT GARDEN.

MDCCCLXXXIV.

1688. e. 1.

IMPRIMATUR

John Jones R. R^mo in Christo Patrie ac Domino D^no Joseph divinâ Providentiâ Archi-Episc. Caerleonens. à Sacris Domesticis.

Ex. Æde Ignotâ.

Kal. Græc. 1884.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE vii

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION 1

BOOK I.—CHAPTER I. 9

CHAPTER II. 14

CHAPTER III. 17

CHAPTER IV. 21

CHAPTER V. 32

PREMIUM TO THE SECOND PART 33

BOOK II.—CHAPTER I. 35

CHAPTER II. 50

CHAPTER III. 60

CHAPTER IV. 68

CHAPTER V. 74

PREFACE.

Curious Reader,

Come with me, I pray, to the wooded hills and dreamy valleys of mine own Siluria. Leave the "chargeable noise of the great town," and stand with me on the mountain that I love, while the wind sweeps over the heather and bracken, bringing with it the salt of the far-away sea. Below us the country is extended; wave after wave of wood and meadow floating in the mist of the morning, and here and there a window-pane shoots back the rays of the mounting sun. In a valley to the east the smoke of a walled city, Caerleon, the metropolitan, arises; and on the yellow water beyond ships are passing in and out of harbour. Just beneath us, on the verge between heather and cornfield, stands an ancient house with mullioned windows that have withstood the storm of many a hundred year, and from its chimneys also a faint blue smoke rises straight till it meets the mountain wind. Here then let us stand awhile and mingle the golden clouds of Virginia with those of Siluria. For, mark me, we have got into a little hollow sheltered from the full strength of the breeze, and a beech-tree that bends over us will give sufficient shade, though, like most of our mountain trees, it is somewhat stunted. Here we can smoke, and meditate, and dream, for a time at least, like to the gods of Epicurus, taking no heed for the turmoil of the world beneath us, but each man, rapt in his

own fancies, weaves them into what he sees, and the whole is very sweet for him to remember hereafter in the midst of the streets, and noisome smoke, and clamour without end. More I say not; let my reader make his dreams for himself of what he may, and if they be even dreams of love I will reprove him not in this place; though in my lecture-room at Brentford it would be otherwise. So if in my book I speak somewhat harshly of Venus and her train, you, O reader, must remember that it is the Professor of Pipe Philosophy in his chair, and not the Silurian on his hills, who does so; and this because he will not tolerate any *imperium* which seems to threaten and diminish the honour of the Pipe and Jar.

Come with me, then, through our shady woods in summer, wander with me by our rivers and wandering brooks, let us drink deep of the life-giving breath of the mountains; and, so it be done moderately, of the cwrw that is without guile. And what the printer has set after this shall be to you my discourse by the way.

A. Ll. J. M.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

It is a thing well known and ascertained that the ancient philosophers were wont to divide their teaching into two parts; of which one was the Esoteric or Acroamatic, and the other the Exoteric. Now the first or Esoteric was that which was taught to the innermost band of disciples, and contained things which were unfit for the hearing of the senseless and evil-minded crowd. But the second or Exoteric was that which was openly taught, and likewise put in writing, and so hath come down to our own days.

And in compiling this book I have thought well to imitate the example of these mighty men of old, and therefore have not writ at all of the Esoteric Doctrines of Pipe Philosophy, not being of a mind to lay open such high and weighty matters to the idle cavils and senseless animadversions that would most surely follow. Therefore doth this book treat alone of the *Fumus Exotericus* and not one whit of the *Flamma Esoterica*.*

* Nevertheless, if any one after reading this should desire to penetrate further, and learn the Esoteric Doctrines of Pipe Philosophy, I will undertake to receive him into my house for the term of twelve calendar months, and by example, superintendence, and other practical methods will instruct him in all that pertains to the study of Cloudiness and general Tubulosity; and before or after the termination of the aforesaid twelve months to the best of my ability will strive to obtain for him remunerative employment on the literary staff of the *Decennial Dudheen*, provided that he first disburse to me the sum of fifty thousand asses. (I would recommend, however, that if any one determine on this course, he should first make himself a master of the art of blacking boots, which is of great service to those who engage in Pipe Philosophy: nay, several of the most respected Pipe Philosophers were at one time bootblacks, and have raised themselves by strenuous exertions to their present position and authority. Leolinus Siluriensis.)

And they for whom this exposition is chiefly intended are those who deem themselves to have already gone through all human erudition, and to have nothing more to learn. For, unless I mistake, before they have digested many pages they will perceive themselves to have been woefully in the wrong, and that here is laid open a new land of science, set far beyond the limits of Ultima Thule. Nay, more, they will read of men and books before unknown; and some perchance in their pride and stiffneckedness will go so far as to dispute the existence thereof.

And at once to put an end for ever to all objections on the matter, I will demonstrate how it has come to pass that such weighty and erudite doctors as Gulielmus Septemhorologiensis, Johannes de Grotibus, Margites Dummerkopfius, and others have been hitherto unknown to mankind.

Know, then, that when it is said of Pythagoras, "With an elementary work on arithmetic in his pocket he visited the East for the acquirement of knowledge," only a part is told, and that a small one. For the truth is that after journeying through Persia and Arabia, and paying a short but lively visit to the land of the Anthropophagi,* he proceeded still further East, until he came to the Seres or Chinese, whom he describeth as γένος παιδαριωδέστατον καὶ εὐτραπελώτατον—a most childlike and bland race,† at which blandness being pleased, he thought to remain there some while.

Now it appeareth that he had already formed his mysterious notions concerning the Divine Essence residing in numbers and sounds; and it was these same ideas that

* Iamblichus, however, sayeth that his sojourn was a long one, and that he enjoyed the patronage of Helluo XV., King of the Cannibal Isles, who at that period gathered round him the most illustrious poets and philosophers of the age. [See *Life and Times of Helluo XV.*, but lately imprinted for Kegan Saul at the sign of the Pig and Whistle in Paternoster-row.]

† For confirmation of this read Harte (Cervus Californicus).

contributed not a little to the shortening of his stay in the country of the Seres. For some time after his advent there, his philosophic meditations on the multiplication table considered as a source of evil were rudely disturbed by a most hideous and awful tumult, which perturbed him not a little, since he perceived that if his disciples were ever to apprehend such a clamour, not only would they ascribe no divinity to sounds, but would even go to the opposite extreme. And on inquiring whence arose this fearful tumult he was answered in Columbarian Greek (the dialect used to communicate with foreigners) that it came from an instrument named the θῶμας-θῶμας, which Bossius conjectures may be probably identified with that which we now call the "tom-tom."*

But a still greater discomfiture awaited our philosopher, and one which threatened to shatter and destroy the very citadel of his system — namely, the divine order and sequence of numbers both in matters terrestrial and celestial. For it happed that playing at astragaloi or *dibs* with one whom he describes as παιδαριωδέστατος καὶ εὐτραπελώτατος παντων — "of all men most bland and childlike,"† the cast of sea-born Aphrodite did fall to his opponent nine times in sequence; while he himself could throw nought but the obscene Bow-wow; and this although the bland one professed an entire nescience of the game and a willingness to be instructed in it. So perceiving that such an event could harmonise in no way with the eternal unities and reciprocities, Pythagoras fled straightway from

* But Trench (Fossarius Hibernensis) will not accept this interpretation, showing the mutation of θῶμας-θῶμας into tom-tom to be utterly at variance with the laws laid down in the "Fabellæ" or Fairy Tales of Grimm; and plainly demonstrates that the only musical instrument which will answer both the requirements of history and etymology is the hurdy-gurdy, which is as plainly connected with θῶμας-θῶμας as "tooth" with "*dens*" or "goose" with "χῆν."

† Cervus Californicus maintaineth that the name of the native was Παπᾶι Ἁμαρτία, or Ah Sin.

that land, fearing to meet perchance with some greater mishap.

And going on ever to the rising of the sun he came at last to the country which we call Kamschatka, but which then was named Cynosimus or Dog's Nose,* so reaching at last the verge of Asia would have doubtless returned to Greece without any material discovery (save only that the game of astragaloi or *dibs* containeth in it much food for thought when played by childlike men), but it fell out that walking the sea-shore he observed a strange and remarkable ship moored close to land. And the strangeness of that ship lay in this—that in place of a mast and sails, such as vessels were wont in those days to have, it was furnished with a tube of well-tempered iron, from whence spouted forth smoke, yea black smoke such as is dear to the heart of Below-Ground Zeus. And on the side thereof were inscribed the mystic characters ΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ.Α',† at which the heart of Pythagoras greatly rejoiced, for he

* And here be it observed that concerning no matter has there been more dispute than concerning the meaning of this word, and no fewer than seven different interpretations have been assigned to the same. And, *imprimis*, it is argued that the name arises from the land jutting out into the sea somewhat in the shape of a nose: *secondly*, that it comes from the water round those coasts resembling in colour the liquid called "dog's nose" (which Pillicoddius stiffly maintaineth to have been known to the ancients under the name of "frigidum sine"): *thirdly*, because the inhabitants of the country were Scythians or Tartars, who as Procuratorius Omniscientius proveth out of Herod. Melp. xxiii.—*καὶ σιμοὶ καὶ γένεια ἔχοντες μεγάλα*—had flat noses: *fourthly*, because the land was hilly, which interpretation is supported by Xenophon. Hellenics. N. 3. 23.—*πρὸς τὸ σιμὸν διώκειν*, to run *up-hill*: *fifthly*, as Vagabundus will have it, because the country is flat, alleging in support of his opinion that the first meaning of *σιμός* is flat: *sixthly*, some assert that the name ariseth from the dolphins that there abound, and bring forward "simum pecus Nerei" that Nonius Marcellus cites out of Livius the old tragedian: *seventhly*, and last, because the land was inhabited by dogs and apes, which if true is mighty strange and admirable.

† Yet the Schoolman Linalaudulus de Tamesi insisteth that the title of the ship was not ΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ.Α', but ΨΑΠΦΑ ΛΑΙΛΟΕΣΣΑ, which he translateth "Saucy Sall."

perceived that now indeed the unities were about to commence. Also besides this he was 'ware of a melodious diapason which proceeded (as he relates) from the ship, exceeding sweet and thrilling, and likewise the noise as of a silver bell, mighty pleasant and tintinnabulous.* And perceiving that the time was now come to dare all things in the cause of philosophy, and calling on the mystic Samothracian divinities ΤΙΝΔΑΛ, ΣΠΕΝΣΕΡ, and ΥΞΑΥ,† he boldly ascended the ship. But the instant he touched the deck the noise that was pleasant and tintinnabulous ceased, and after pouring forth one profuse strain of unpremeditated art, likewise ceased the harmonious diapason; and by some mysterious power Pythagoras was borne away over that unknown sea.

Now concerning his voyage there is no certain record, and although many weighty tomes have been written on the matter, the jejunality of this work doth not suffer me to treat of it; so suffice it to say that after a short and fair journey he was at last, with many diapasons and tintinnabulous rejoicings, landed on the opposite coast. But he had scarcely reached the land when a grave and reverend man accosted him, and hailing him nasiloquently as "stranger" gave him welcome. And after the first greetings were over, and the autochthon had ascertained at how many drachmas the πῆχυς Pythagoras had purchased his ἱμάτιον, he informed him that his name was Odysseus B. Podge, Prince of the Caucusidæ,‡ and proposed that they should

* And in confirmation of this refer to the Minervic Disputations of Theodorus Wattsius (the same that wrote the song of the untiring bee that barketh and biteth), who maintains that the noise was even as the noise of a perfect sonnet, whose testimony is strengthened by Proctoratus Omniscientius, who affirms that whatever proceeds from Wattsius is "plainly worded and exactly described."

† Concerning the worship of these deities see Classical Dictionary, articles Pelasgi and Cabeiria. The sacrifices offered to them consisted of the parasites of black swine gathered under the waning moon.

‡ From the fact of the autochthon's name being Odysseus, and his claiming to be Prince of the Caucusidæ, Bossius conjectures that the Americans are of Greek descent, and had formerly dwelt in the Highlands of the Caucasus.

immediately fare unto an adjoining temple and pour libations to the deathless gods. And although it was early in the morning, when the Greeks were not accustomed to perform such rites, Pythagoras denied him not, and going to the temple honey-sweet wine was brought them, which Pythagoras affirms to have been in strength like unto a wall of stone, and they poured libations in the customary manner. But when Pythagoras made known unto the prince the intent and purpose of his voyage—namely, the seeking out of new and strange philosophies and observances—he sware a dreadful oath. For he sware by the eagle that spreads his wings widely extended over the land of the Setting Sun, by the Capitol wherein they cease not to worship the deathless gods, by all the wheeling Stars of heaven, and the grievous Stripes wherewith the gods plague men, that Pythagoras should accomplish his desire and return again to his native land.

And so indeed he performed his vow, and imparted to Pythagoras the whole theory and practice of Pipe Philosophy, and gave him of the herb that is more powerful than moly and sweeter than ambrosia; and after he had sojourned there a long while he again embarked on the magic ship, carrying with him much tobacco and many clay pipes, and so came again to Cynosimus.

From thence he went on his way rejoicing through the country of the Seres, nathless taking much care not to linger in the towns where they were wont to play the θῶμας-θῶμας, nor did he venture aught in the game of astragaloi or dibs, which in his heart he determined to forbid to his disciples as a game unbefitting a philosopher and utterly contrary to all unity and reciprocity.

So, to make a long matter short, Pythagoras returned home by way of Ægypt, then much perturbed by the cabals and discontents of an insolent soldier, who out of the malice of his heart persuading the common folk that they had a just claim to the management and enjoyment of their own country, incited them to revolt. And for a time it was like

to have gone hard with Pharaoh, but he called on Gelon, Tyrant of Syracuse, to assist him in his hour of need. And Gelon, out of the great goodness and benevolence of his heart, thinking not at all of any gain or reward accruing to himself, did presently send a mighty fleet of ships, furnished with many banks of oars, and armed with all manner of tormentuous engines, both petroboli and catapeltæ, by which the people of Ægypt were soon utterly overcome and smashed. And the counsellors of Gelon were no less wise at home than in the wars; for perceiving that the vulgar folk did in some sort animadvert on the sending of the ships, they employed certain machines of burnished steel, cunningly contrived for the purpose by geometers, wherewith they blinded the eyes of the people so that they might not perceive what was being accomplished.

But when the land was conquered and laid waste, and Pharaoh thought to have been received back to the throne, Gelon did, *more scholastico*, make perfect a juncture between his thumb and his nose, and so mocked him, bidding him journey to the City of the Waters of the Sun (which men do now call Bath), or if he liked not that, to the City of Palm Trees, which is Jericho. And so Pharaoh, being in the hieroglyphical language of Ægypt "done brown," ceased to reign, and Gelon of Syracuse reigned in his stead, and his descendants after him, even until the Gauls overran the whole world from Jerusalem to Madagascar.

And Pythagoras carefully considering all these matters, yet forgot not the multiplicity of chests of cedar-wood he bore with him, wherein was stored the precious herb. And in the dead of night he would often secretly light his pipe and smoke without hindrance, till the fumes being apprehended he was accused of gramarye, and so driven from the land. But when he came to Croton in Italy he called together such as he deemed worthy, and imparted to them the great secret whereat they rejoiced mightily, and proceeded to test the greatness thereof by experiment. And though at the first some were perturbed both in body and

mind by reason of the virtue of the herb (it being of the kind poetically called ἡ οὐρὰ τοῦ σύος or the tail of the pig), yet at last all attained to the dignity of good and sturdy Pipe Philosophers.

But notwithstanding the vows of secrecy which Pythagoras had laid on his disciples, it began to be noised abroad that there were certain men who inhaled the smoke of a herb which made them contented with all things; whereat the populace grew justly indignant, and as History telleth us (though, as is usual, it lies for the most part), burnt down the club of the Pythagoreans, and with it was destroyed all the tobacco which was stored therein. And from that time no man in Europe saw tobacco for nigh two thousand years, but yet the knowledge of it was kept alive by tradition and handed down till it was restored again. And when it was so restored, those wise men who had before known of it only by theory were able to ascertain empirically whether their ideas concerning it were true, and thus was formed the modern school of Pipe Philosophers. Yet by their assuming names such as Margites Dummerkopfius, Linalaudulus de Tamesi, Jacobulus Corvinus, and the like, and by their writing in such a way as shall only be understood by the initiate, their very existence hath been ignored and passed over.

But in the two thousand three hundred and forty-fifth year after the journey of Pythagoras at a chapter of the principal among the Pipe Philosophers it was determined that it would be well to promulgate in some way the aforesaid Philosophy; and the lot being taken the office fell upon me; and I have writ this book in discharge of the command.

In the name, therefore, of Dionysos Sabazios, Zagreus, Abraxas, Iao, Haix-Tetrax, and Damnemeneus: Κὸγξ ὄμπαξ; Farewell.

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

THE Pipe Philosophy is divided into two parts, which must be dealt with separately and in no wise confounded.

Now the first part concerns itself with the matter (*materies*), and the second part with the manner (*modus*). The matter contains all things used in smoking, such as be pipes, tobacco, and so on; and the manner treats of the ways in which smoking can be considered. And since we cannot treat of the latter as it ought to be treated without a perfect knowledge of the former, it followeth of necessity that we must first consider at length the matter, and that being thoroughly digested, pass on to the manner.

Now, matter being taken first, it is proper that it should be reasonably anatomised and divided; and the division commonly in vogue is that into four kinds—namely (1) necessary matter; (2) contingent necessary matter; (3) contingent unnecessary matter; (4) impossible matter. And the meaning of these terms is as follows:—

(1) Necessary matter is that without which the act of smoking is impossible.

(2) Contingent necessary matter is that which, although not absolutely necessary to the act of smoking, is seldom wanting.

(3) Contingent unnecessary matter comprehends such things as are convenient in smoking, but are wholly unnecessary.

(4) Impossible matter is that of which it is possible to inhale the fumes through a pipe; but since it is not tobacco, the inhaling of its fumes is not smoking, and with it it is impossible to smoke.

Now, to make reference to these four kinds of matter more easy, each hath had a memorial letter assigned to it as follows :—

Necessary Matter	Q.
Contingent Necessary Matter . . .	U.
Contingent Unnecessary Matter . .	I.
Impossible Matter	D.

Which letters being compounded into one word Quid give the whole division of matter; or, as the Schoolmen do name it, the "Quidditas," which Quidditas being subdivided and cut up, appeareth in Synopsis, *ut infra.*

Q. Necessary Matter . . Tobacco.

U. Contingent Necessary Matter . { Pipes. / Cigar Tubes.

I. Contingent Unnecessary Matter . . . . { Tobacco Pouches. R. / Cigar Cases. O. / Tobacco Jars. T.

D. Impossible Matter . { Canes. B. / Brown Paper. O. / Non-nicotinous Herbs. S. / Opium. H.

Note, then, that in this synopsis the subdivisions of I and D are marked with other significant letters; and for the better remembering the whole division, the following hexameters are much to the purpose :—

> Q Tabacum teneat: des U Calamosque cigarris,
> Et Tubulos: ac I solam Rot continet omne:
> Ultima Bosh teneat, quæ D—— dicatur; et usque
> Dum spiro fumem, recubans sub tegmine fagi.*

* Concerning these notable lines much dispute hath arisen, and especially as to the last. For Sabrinus Corollarius conjectures from the last half thereof that the author must have had access to Vergilius' waste-

And by this synopsis we ascertain the exact signification of the four categories. For it is evident that in necessary matter tobacco is the only thing absolutely necessary to smoking, and in contingent necessary matter that pipes and cigar-tubes, though not absolutely necessary, are, in the vast majority of cases, used. As to contingent unnecessary matter, it is plain that men can very well smoke without possessing jars or pouches; but as to impossible matter, since smoking is defined as "the inhaling of the fume of tobacco," it is evident that the inhaling of the fume of aught beside tobacco is not smoking, and that therefore with such it is impossible to smoke.

This, then, is the generally-received division of matter, and the explanation thereof; but before we proceed to examine the subdivisions of the four categories more precisely, it is needful to notice certain opinions of those who do not assent to the above division.

For, in the first place, there are philosophers who would delete contingent unnecessary matter on the ground that if a man smoke he must have tobacco, and this tobacco must have position. Now, since jar, pouch, &c., are terms of which the meaning is "things to contain tobacco," it follows that anything which contains tobacco will come under the same category. But it has been shown that tobacco must be contained by something—*i.e.*, have position; therefore the matter now named unnecessary should rightly be termed necessary, though contingently and not absolutely.

paper basket, while Bibliothecarius Classicus denies that Vergilius had a waste-paper basket at all, and holds the writer to have been one of the brilliant circle of poets and philosophers who gathered round the famous Pomposus de Bretoburcus, citing as a proof the expression, "dum spiro fumem," which he compares to the fragment "dum spiro, spero," universally attributed to Bretoburcus. The purpose and intent of the line after the D hath also been the subject of much strife, some assigning to the letter a mystical and cabalistic meaning, and identifying it with that D which, according to Gilbertus, it was not lawful for seamen to utter. But on this see the Orphic poem of Gilbertus, called D. M. S. PINAPHORIA.

Secondly come those who attack the scholastic definition of smoking—"the inhaling the fume of tobacco"—and substitute for it "the inhaling the fume of any soporific or narcotic herb or substance," the effect of which is to alter in some manner the category of impossible matter. For in accordance with their theory they remove opium and all narcotics as being not really impossible, and place them in a new category of contingently possible matter. These men, however, do not go as far as some, who would abolish impossible matter altogether, their definition of smoking being "the inhaling the smoke of any substance whatsoever," thus putting the vile cabbage on an equality with our superexcellent herb. But the more reasonable of the Soporifics (as they may fairly be named) argue somewhat as follows:—

If I be, perchance, an inhabitant of some land in which tobacco is unknown, but where a herb of like properties is used in its place, then for me that herb becomes in truth necessary matter; for I know of none other, and without it smoking would be, as far as I am concerned, impossible.

Yet, admitting that in this there is some tincture of reason, we must not let ourselves be bewildered into accepting such a theory. For it is to be remarked that these divergencies arise from a denying of the scholastic definition, and the substitution of one more or less plausible. But we of the orthodox school, who pride ourselves on having kept the Divine tradition intact and unaltered from the days of Pythagoras, will not suffer one jot or tittle to be abated from the wisdom of our predecessors, and are therefore untouched by these curious subtleties.

But with regard to those who would affirm that all receptacles of tobacco are contingently necessary, I confess their sophistries are somewhat less facile to grapple with.

Now I will not deny their main thesis, that if I smoke tobacco I must have tobacco; that that tobacco must be contained by something; that the various subdivisions of "pouch," "jar," &c., are merely different sorts of things for

containing tobacco; and therefore that they are necessary. So in some wise they are in the right. But if we consider that the category is applied strictly to the *act* of smoking without reference *à parte ante* or *à parte post*, but only to the very *act* itself, we shall perceive the Schoolmen to have been in the right in maintaining that category to be valid. For taking their heterodox position we might as fairly maintain that *ash-trays* are necessary, seeing that before a pipe can be filled with tobacco the ashes that be in it must be emptied out; that these ashes being matter must be contained by something (and ash-tray is only a name given to a thing for the containing of ashes): therefore ash-trays are necessary. And again arguing *à parte ante* we may conclude that earth itself is necessary to smoking. For if I smoke I must have tobacco, and that tobacco must have been produced from the earth; therefore earth is necessary. But since no reasonable man would dream of classing it as necessary matter, we hereby perceive the vanity and inutility of such reasoning,

And so the scholastic categories having been put to the test and vindicated, we are free to close the present matter and pass on to the next section with clear pipes, unbefouled with the Acrid Oil of Sophistry and the Uliginous Ashes of Unreason.

CHAPTER II.

With respect to tobacco, let it be defined as follows:—"Tabacus est herba in quâ inest nicotinica et soporifera virtus"—Tobacco is a herb in which resides a nicotinic and soporific virtue.

Next to definition cometh division, which, sooth to say, is somewhat difficult and requireth consideration. And the reason of this difficulty is to be imputed to a certain variant form of tobacco known as the cigar—that is to say, tobacco, not shred finely, but rolled and compacted in such a way as to be smokable without the medium of a pipe. Also there is another form known as the cigarette, which is shred tobacco constricted within a roll of thin paper. Some would differentiate these two forms and consider them apart, but I deem it unnecessary, and have devised a plan which compriseth all kinds within a small compass, which I here present thee with:—



Now methinks I hear many a one objecting to this synopsis, and pronouncing it as altogether meagre and imperfect, containing nought but a mere outline of the subject, and that done after a strange manner.

And in answer to such objections, if they be made, I reply as follows:—

First, as to the main plan, it is clear that all tobacco in ordinary use must come from one of three places. (1) From America, which I call *Occidental* or Hesperidian tobacco. (2) From Asia (under Asia I include Roumelia, though Mercator should reprove me). And this I call Oriental tobacco. (3) From the Continent of Europe, which I call Continental tobacco. *Secondly*, as to the imperfection and bareness of the scheme. I imagine that the specific fault found with it will be that there are no *Honey Dews*, *Golden Clouds*, or *Bird's Eyes* under tobacco; and no *Regalias*, *Reinitas*, or *Intimidads* under cigars. The reason for this omission is that these are rather matters for the tobacconist to consider than the Pipe Philosopher, who, so far from bringing to every subject a microscopic meticulosity, knows well the limits and bounds of his science, and when to be full and when to be brief. And, in fine, were I to admit any of these distinctions into my synopsis it would be but an advertisement fit to be displayed in a booth, and altogether unmeet for the study of a philosopher. So I know nought of them; but in so far as the principal kinds have different qualities and influences on the mind and body of the smoker, they shall be briefly treated of in the second part of this book.

Next, with respect to differences between philosophers as to the nature of tobacco: *mirabile dictu* these are few and trifling, there being little dispute upon the matter. Only, as I have mentioned before, some would consider tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes separately, thinking thus to prevent those disputes which we shall come upon shortly as to the nature and essence of pipes. And in some wise there is wisdom in this, for if their division should obtain a great

part of the grounds of difference between the philosophers of the bowl and the philosophers of the tube would be cut away, and they might be at one; but yet on the other hand these same contentions have led to an infinite amount of learned ingenuity and metaphysical refinement, which 'twere surely pity to render of no account. And further, besides that *expediency* is on our side, the present concatenation is assuredly good, valid, and just, and worth retaining for its own sake. For to separate cigars from tobacco would be as if in a natural history there were separate chapters—one treating of sheep shorn and the other of sheep unshorn, which were folly. For it is certain that cigars are tobacco, and come under the definition, "a herb in which resides a soporific and nicotinic virtue;" and therefore to treat of the two apart on a doubtful ground of utility would be grave error. Furthermore, to do so would "make harsh the liquid melodies"* of those famous lines beginning, "Q tabacum teneat," which is not to be borne. And so, by analogy, I think that these doctrines will not obtain, for, as is well known, some while ago a certain Scotch logician did bring forward amendments in the Art of Logic, which if they had been carried out, *Barbara Celarent* would have been abolished and done away with. But yet, notwithstanding the pretended utility of these improvements, *Barbara Celarent vigentque valentque* (as Ovidius writes of a different matter): nay, by all accounts, there be students at one of our Universities who will go further and (still with Ovidius) prefix *intempestive* or *unseasonably*, seeing that the ignorance of Barbara Celarent doth entail no small inconvenience and discomfort in the precincts of the *Forum Suarium*, or Pig Market.

Concerning tobacco, therefore, let such things have been said. And this is all that can be said as to definition.

* I use the words of Gossius, *De Auctore Hesperidum*.

CHAPTER III.

I. LET a pipe (tubulus fumificus) be defined "instrumentum per quod tabaci fumus trahitur"—as an instrument by which the smoke of tobacco is inhaled.

II. Let a bowl (vas) be defined "ea pars tubuli fumifici in quâ tabacus ponitur fumandus"—as that part of a pipe in which the tobacco that is to be smoked is placed.

III. Let a stem (fistula) be defined "ea pars tubuli fumifici per quam tabaci fumus e vase in os ducitur"—as that part of a pipe by which the smoke is educted from the bowl into the mouth.

IV. Let a mouthpiece (enstomateium) be defined "ea, pars fistulæ quæ vasi remotissima est, et quæ à fistula quoad materiam differt"—as that part of the stem which is furthest from the bowl, and differs from the stem in matter.

V. Let a lid (operculum) be defined "id quod nonnullo vasi adjungitur, ne tabacus vento dispergatur"—as that which is sometimes affixed to the bowl lest the tobacco be scattered by the wind.

VI. Let a hookah (vox Indica quæ Latiné nominatur "tubulus fumificus aquarius") be defined "tubuli fumifici species quædam, in quâ tabaci fumus per aquam trahitur"—as a certain kind of pipe in which the smoke of tobacco is drawn through water.

VII. Ornament (ornamentum) is said to exist "cum tubulus fumificus, aut in vase, aut in fistulâ, non planam habet superficiem"—when a pipe, be it in the bowl or be it in the stem, hath not a flat surface.

VIII. Essential colour (color nativus) is said to exist "cum *facientis* per artem, tubuli fumifici superficies pigmento quolibet imbuta est"—when by the art of the maker the surface of a pipe hath been imbued with some pigment.

IX. Accidental colour (color factitius seu nicotinicus) is said to exist "cum per artem et perseverantiam *fumantis*, tubulus fumificus adeo oleo nicotinico imbutus est, ut ater aut subfuscus fiat"—when by the art and perseverance of the smoker a pipe hath been so imbued with the oil of tobacco that it becomes of a jet-black or brownish hue.

X. A pipe is said to be simple (simplex) "cum solum ex unâ materie constat"—when it consists of only one kind of matter.

XI. A pipe is said to be complex (complexus) "cum habet materiem complexam"—when it is composed of complex matter—that is to say, of more than one kind of matter.

Such are the eleven scholastic definitions of pipes, the various parts of pipes, the essential or accidental colour of pipes, and lastly the two definitions of simplicity and complicity, by the observance of which the Schoolmen have been able to divide all pipes into two great classes. Time was, indeed, when many were for three divisions—viz., simple, complex, and decomplex; wherein complex signified composed of two kinds of matter, and decomplex of more than two; but the researches of the learned and ingenious Schoolman Peter Pfeiffe* (whose famous investigation into the nature of pickled pepper is a byword to this day) went far to demolish this theory, which received its final blow at the hands of the recluse Jacobulus de Cornibus. So we have to consider only two classes, with their various and minute divisions and subdivisions, which are given at length in the following SYNOPSIS OF PIPES:—

* Petrus Fistularius, known as Magister Quidditatum, and Doctor Quidditatissimus.

SIMPLE.

CLAY.

As to Length.

I. Long.
II. Of moderate length. B
III. Short.

As to Essential Colour.

I. White.
II. Black. S
III. Red.
IV. Of two or more colours.

As to Accidental Colour.

I. Those which can be coloured well.
II. Those which can be coloured ill. T
III. Those which can be coloured not at all.

As to Ornament.

I. Those which have ornament. R
II. Those which have not ornament.

As to Mouthpieces.

I. Those which have mouthpieces
  (1) Of true amber.
  (2) Of false amber.
  (3) Of bone. P
  (4) Of ivory.
  (5) Of composition.
II. Those which have not mouthpieces.

As to Lids.

I. Those which have lids
  (1) Of gold.
  (2) Of silver. O
  (3) Of base metal.
II. Those which have not lids.

As to Bowls.

I. Those which have large bowls.
II. Those which have moderate bowls. L
III. Those which have small bowls.

WOOD.

As to Length.

I. Long.
II. Of moderate length F
III. Short.

As to Essential Colour.

I. Black. L
II. Dark brown.
III. Light brown.

As to Accidental Colour.

I. Those which can be coloured well.
II. Those which can be coloured ill. B
III. Those which can be coloured not at all.

As to Ornament.

I. Those which have ornament. E
II. Those which have not ornament.

As to Mouthpieces.

I. Those which have mouthpieces
  (1) Of true amber.
  (2) Of false amber.
  (3) Of bone. R
  (4) Of ivory.
  (5) Of composition.
II. Those which have not mouthpieces.

As to Lids.

I. Those which have lids
  (1) Of gold.
  (2) Of silver. A
  (3) Of base metal.
II. Those which have not lids.

As to Bowls.

I. Those which have large bowls.
II. Those which have moderate bowls. S
III. Those which have small bowls.

As to sort of Wood.

I. Of briar-root.
II. Of cherry.
III. Of elder. T
IV. Of chestnut.
V. Of myall.
VI. Of cocus.

COMPLEX.

CLAY.

As to Stem.

I. Of bone.
II. Of wood.
III. Of composition.

As to Flexible Tube.

I. Of silk.
II. Of india-rubber.
III. Of heterogeneous matter.

WOOD.

As to Stem.

I. Of bone.
II. Of composition.

As to Flexible Tube.

I. Of silk.
II. Of india-rubber.
III. Of heterogeneous matter.

CHINA.

As to Stem.

I. Of wood.

As to Flexible Tube.

I. of silk.
II. Of india-rubber.
III. Of heterogeneous matter.

HOOKAH.

VASE OF CHINA.

As to Tubes—Number.

I. Those which have one tube.
II. Those which have more than one tube.

As to Tubes—Matter.

I. Of silk.
II. Of india-rubber.
III. Of heterogeneous matter.

As to Tubes—Length.

I. Those which have long tubes.
II. Those which have moderate tubes.
III. Those which have short tubes.

VASE OF GLASS.

As to Tubes—Number.

I. Those which have one tube.
II. Those which have more than one tube.

As to Tubes—Matter.

I. Of silk.
II. Of india-rubber.
III. Of heterogeneous matter.

As to Tubes—Length.

I. Those which have long tubes.
II. Those which have moderate tubes.
III. Those which have short tubes.

And to help the memory of the student are adjoined these six hexameters, which I deem of not such pure and classical Latinity as the former ones, but which are, nathless, well adapted to their purpose :—

Binis ordinibus tubuli ponantur : et Alter
Est Simplex ; fit diversis è partibus Alter.
In primis Simplex classis disjungitur æque,
Fictilis è terrâ, sequitur tum ligneus ordo.
OBSTRoPOLous alio, FLaBbERgAST atque secundo
Pertinet. Cui legat, tubulum succendere fas est.

Further, by way of comment upon the synopsis, it is to be observed that in the complex order the various subdivisions of the simple order are to be understood, with such obvious differences as will be apparent to all. For example, china pipes do not admit of accidental colour since they are already *percocti ;* also in a hookah essential colour may coexist in two parts—in the vase for holding the water, and the bowl for the tobacco.

Lastly, whereas some may reproach me for not having mentioned meerschaum pipes, I reply that meerschaum is merely a kind of clay, and whatever may be said of ordinary clay pipes may also be repeated as to meerschaum pipes (save that they have no essential colour). And seeing that this synopsis hath cost me much anxious thought and twisting of my brain, I do pray thee to excuse any defect thou mayest observe (though, indeed, I do hope that none exist). For while the general division into simple and complex hath long existed, yet the disputes and argumentations of the different schools hath left well-nigh every other matter in doubt and confusion. And at this point I must enjoin thee to truss up thine intellect and make it sure and fast, since we are about to enter upon the doctrines of the several schools, compared to which the Olive Groves of the Academy, and the Peripati of the Lyceum are but onion-trees and bitter cucumbers. So empty thy pipe, and let the tobacco in the next one be heedfully pressed down and clearly lighted.

CHAPTER IV.

Now the six principal schools of philosophers who dispute concerning pipes are as follows:—

(1) The *Chorizontic* or *Separatists.*
(2) The *Solidic.*
(3) The *Medioliquprean.*
(4) The *Megacremasuotic.*
(5) The *Cœlosphaeric* or *Cyclosematic.*
(6) The *Orthoꝓoetic.*

And, to take them in the above order, the Chorizontics maintain the following thesis—that if a pipe be simple, considered apart from its mouthpiece, it is also simple with it—that is to say, the mouthpiece should not be held to affect in any way the dichotomy into simple and complex, the two essential parts which are to be considered being the bowl and stem, in support of which the learned Boëterbroddius argues thus:—"If I make me a bowl of wood, fitting to it a stem, also of wood, it is plain that such pipe is simple. Next, if I procure a lid of silver and affix it to the bowl, the pipe still remains simple (since the possession of a lid is an accident of a pipe). Finally then if I get a mouthpiece of amber and fit it to the stem, since a mouthpiece as well as a lid is an accident and not a property or differentia, that pipe will continue simple, and should be considered as such."—*Boëterbroddius. De Re Fumariâ*, b. viii., p. 987. And the Chorizontic definition of a complex pipe is this:—"A complex pipe is such that it cannot become simple without ceasing to be a pipe."

But, on the other hand, the no less learned Dreckenhauserius, chief of the opposite School of Solidics, expresses his judgment as follows:—"A complex pipe is one in which the matter is not homogeneous. So that if any pipe contain

or be composed of more than one kind of matter, that pipe is complex. But a wooden pipe with an amber mouthpiece contains more than one kind of matter; for it contains both wood and amber (here followeth a dissertation of some ten pages as to the nature of amber, and as to how far it may be identified with the ἤλεκτρον of the Greeks). Therefore a wooden pipe with an amber mouthpiece is complex. Further it is to be remembered that in some pipes the mouthpiece far exceeds in length the true stem, which often does not continue for more than an inch or two beyond the bowl; and to say that in such case the mouthpiece is no essential part of the pipe were surely a rank and insane absurdity.

Such being the opinions of the Chorizontic and Solidic Schools, I shall next proceed to those held by the Medioliquoreans, or half-and-half philosophers, to whom I myself do for the most part incline. Now this School teacheth that the Chorizontics are right and wrong, and the Solidics wrong and right, which seems to me a happy and dexterous distinction. For they agree with the Chorizontics in asserting that the term "pipe" doth by no means of necessity imply the possession of a mouthpiece; so on that ground they allow that the Separatists have reason in refusing to take the mouthpiece into account when making division into simple and complex. But, on the other hand, they do not dispute the contention of the Solidics in the case of a pipe that hath but an inch of true stem, and four or five inches of mouthpiece; and will allow that in such case the pipe should be classed as complex rather than simple.

So that in fact the Medioliquorean must examine the pipe before he will venture to class it; and if it be, by example, a pipe of briar-root six inches as to total length, of which half an inch consists of the mouthpiece, he shall set it down as simple; but if, per contra, it be of six inches of total length, having a true stem of half an inch, and an amber mouthpiece of five and a half inches, then shall it be considered as complex.

Fourthly come the Megacremasuotics, so called ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴέναι πάντα τὸν σῦν, because they go the whole hog.* And their doctrine is this:—The term "pipe" doth comprise every part which any given pipe possesses, whether it be differentia, property, or accident. And a pipe which, whether by reason of its mouthpiece, lid, colour, or joint in its bowl, stem, or mouthpiece, hath in it more than one kind of matter, cannot be simple. For they define the term simple as denoting an absolute unity of matter, and allege that as amber both true and false, ivory both true and false, bone and every manner of composition (as to mouthpiece), gold, silver, and base metal (with regard to lids); red, blue, and yellow (with regard to colour, since colour cannot exist on a pipe without the agency of that material substance called paint);—are all certainly matter; therefore they aver that if to Z + A (by which symbol is denoted the joining of the essence and existence) there be added any matter which is not A, then Z + A + a . . . — the simple pipe becomes Z + A + x — the complex pipe.

Such are the doctrines of the Megacremasuotic School of Pipe Philosophers.

Fifthly, let us take the Cœlosphaeric or Cyclosematic School. And their teaching is this:—The real essence of the pipe is contained in the bowl, whence cometh the name Cœlosphaeric (Κοιλοσφαιρικοί), since they regard the bowl as the root, from out of which, from reasons of practical utility and convenience, the stem hath sprung; some saying that the first pipe was a bowl in which tobacco was placed, and the smoke drawn out from a hole in the side. They profess to find a support to these doctrines in the fact that supposing any one should detach the stem from the bowl he would by no means call the stem by itself a pipe, whereas a bowl without a stem might very well be called so.

* This is the interpretation of the Pseudo-Smithus and Johannes de Grotibus, but Jacobulus Corvinus insists that it should be rendered the "complete swine," to whom Gulielmus Septemhorologiensis objects that the real meaning is rather "the entire animal."

Further, by analogy they liken a pipe to a tree. Now without a root the stem of a tree cannot exist, whereas it is conceivable that a root should exist without a stem. So with the bowl and stem of a pipe, they name the bowl the inevitable part and the stem the evitable. They also lay stress on the shape of the bowl, which is circular. Now a circle is the most perfect geometrical conception, and therefore the bowl is the most perfect and ideal part of the pipe, the stem being that part invented by man to bring the whole down to his lower and grosser level. Lastly, they affirm that in the bowl there always resides essence, and sometimes existence also; that in the bowl and stem conjoined there is both essence and existence; and in the stem alone neither essence nor existence.

Sixthly cometh the Orthopoetic Philosophers, so called for that they, rejecting the dogma of the Cœlosphaerics that the essence resides in the bowl, maintain that it is in the stem (τὸ μέρος τὸ ὀρθόν), and that the first pipe was a tube, in one end of which tobacco was placed, and the smoke thereof drawn through the other; to strengthen which doctrine they adduce the pipes used by Asiatics for the inhaling of the fumes of opium, which do not possess a bowl, but only a place in the stem in which to set the opium. And in opposition to the Cœlosphaerics, who affirm that one who had cut off the stem of his pipe would not call the stem by itself a pipe, they reply that "pipe" is a conventional term, by which is meant the whole instrument as we have it at the present day; and, since the time when pipes had no bowls is long gone by, it is according to nature that men should have come to regard the bowl as an essential part; yet, while admitting this, they by no means admit the contrary—that if the bowl be separated from the stem it is still spoken of as a pipe, but rather that it is called by its own name "bowl," or with the adjective "pipe" prefixed to it, that is "pipe-bowl." And the smoke-addicted and ingenious (though perchance somewhat too eristical) Dummerkopfius, who for a long while past hath

stood in the van of battle for the Orthopoetics, seizes as with a vice upon this very expression "pipe-bowl," and shows it to be a compound substantive, in which "pipe" used as an adjective defines and limits the substantive bowl, and is a term of wider distribution than bowl. And since the term "pipe" extends more widely than "bowl," it follows that there are some pipes which have not bowls; and therefore that, so far from a bowl containing the whole essence of a pipe, there is no reason why a pipe should have a bowl at all. (See diagram.*) Next he proceeds by analogy, and chooseth the words "horse-cloth," "nose-ring," which are in every way similar to "pipe-bowl." And firstly let "horse-cloth" be taken, in which it is manifest that a horse may have both essence and existence without possessing a cloth, which is an accident of "horse." Secondly, "nose-ring," in which it is manifest also that a nose is perfect and complete without a ring being attached to it.†



So noses existing without rings, and horses without cloths, it is manifest that pipes do exist without bowls.

Next the acute and cloud-compelling Dummerkopfius proceeds by etymology, and demonstrates thus:—The common name of anything expresses the common meaning attached to that thing when that common name was first

* In this diagram the larger circle (A) comprehends all pipes, the smaller circle (C) all bowls; while the space within the circumferences of both circles (B) denotes all pipe-bowls. So it is evident there are some pipes wholly distinct and separated from bowls, and therefore a bowl is no essential part of a pipe.

† And the conclusion seems in the main correct; but see on this point the *Distinctiones Meticulosæ* of Pseudo-Spitsbubius (Magister Distinctionum), who opines that the noses of hogs are by no means complete without rings, and adds that, if necessary, he can confirm this dictum from his own experience.

given. And if no other name can be shown to have existed before that which is now used, then that name expresses the primary and essential conception of the thing named. So that if we find by investigation that a "thing-for-smoking-tobacco" has always been named a "pipe," and is called so now, then we determine that the word "pipe" expresses the primary, essential, and common meaning of a "thing-for-inhaling-tobacco." Next let us determine the meaning of the word by etymology. It appears that the primary notion expressed by this word is "whistling," hence it was probably framed by *onomatopœia*, as more plainly appears in the German "pfeiffe" and the Latin "fistula," which do counterfeit in some measure the noise of whistling.* Therefore the etymological first intention of the term "pipe" is "something which whistles."

But when we inquire what is the logical first intention, at first sight there appears some difficulty. For to take a good example of first and second intention, "bird" in its first intention is an animal that has feathers, in its second intention a partridge, and I do not perceive how we can assign a first intention to "pipe" quite in this manner, Second intentions, however, are sufficiently numerous, as will be seen when we consider that an organist, a plumber, and a pastoral poet use the term each in a peculiar technical sense, plainly constituting second intention. But shall we not agree, supposing an organist to be conversing with a plumber, or a plumber with a pastoral poet, that in speaking to one another they would use the term "pipe" with the meaning of an instrument used in smoking? And is not this, then, the logical first intention of the word pipe? Such, at all events, it appears to me.

Thus, then, I have proved that when we pronounce the word "pipe" in common language we imply remotely and etymologically "something that whistles," and directly and

* See Tully, *In Atticum Epistolæ*, I., 16, 11. "Itaque et ludis et gladiatoribus mirandas *ἐπισημασίας* sine ulla pastoricia *fistula* auferebamus.

logically "an instrument used in smoking." How, then, can the Cœlosphaerics contend that the bowl is the essential part? For bowls cannot whistle, either of themselves or by the help of another. And if the essence and primary nature lies in the bowl, why do we not call this "instrument for smoking" a bowl and not a pipe? And how comes it to pass that we do not call the stem a "bowl-pipe?" *Responde mihi, O genus cœlosphaericum et rotundum!*

Finally Dummerkopfius citeth the famous *Sorites Smalgrueli.* The name of a thing expresses the innate ideas we have of that thing; the name of an "instrument for smoking tobacco" is a pipe; the name pipe expresses not ideas of sphæricity and circularity, but of length and hollowness; therefore our innate ideas of an "instrument for smoking tobacco" are not conceptions of sphæricity and circularity, but conceptions of length and hollowness."

But the Cœlosphaerics reply, in answer to the "pipe-bowl" argument, that Dummerkopfius might as well argue from the term "goat-skin" that goats can exist without skins, and that such analogous arguments are absurd and sophistical, and quote in support the words of Devey, who asserts that "we cannot adduce any example in which the force of an analogous argument arises above that of weak probability;" and as to the etymological argument that it is futile, else we might conclude that all "priests" are old men, that the Esquimaux are "nonchalant" *quia non calent,* that no one can be "insulted" unless his adversary leaps on him, that all "imbeciles" lean on staffs, and lastly that two persons cannot be "rivals" unless they dwell on the banks of the same river.

But to return to the Orthopoetics: they, in reply to the Cœlosphaeric ideas concerning the perfection of the circular form, maintain that a circle itself is but a number of straight lines joined angularly and continuously to one another in such a way as to form a circular figure; and as that which makes to exist must be prior to that which exists, therefore the idea of a straight line is primary, while

the idea of a circle is secondary. They also aver that the circle is a barren figure generating nothing; whereas from straight lines are produced all the rectilineal figures. To which the Cyclosematics reply that the *idea* of a circle must have existed before these straight lines were joined to form one, even admitting that they were so joined, which they say is not proven—nay, rather they aver that by taking away an infinitely small part of the circumference of a circle a straight line was generated; and finally that the objections of the Orthopoetics apply only to the *circumference* of the circle, and not to the *circle* itself. For the definition of Euclides commences, "A circle is a plane figure contained by one line which is called the circumference," where it is evident that the circle is not the circumference, which is only a formal part necessary to render the ideal conception of a circle comprehensible by our material senses; for if the terms "circle" and "circumference" were identical, then would a thing be said to be contained by itself, which is impossible.

To whom rejoin the Orthopoetics that the essence of anything is "that which makes it to be what it is;" that essence is divided into two parts—the material part or genus, and the formal part or differentia. Now the definition of a circle is "A circle is a plane figure contained by one line which is called the circumference," which definition "a plane figure" is the genus, and "contained by one line" the differentia; and since if the differentia be taken away the essence no longer remains, therefore if the idea of circumference be separated from the idea of circle, as the Cyclosematics direct, then no essence remains, and a circle does not exist. But we know that circles do exist, therefore their arguments are erroneous and absurd.

Now amongst the arguments of the Cœlosphaerics we noticed one that made comparison between the root of a tree and the bowl of a pipe. Know, then, that the Orthopoetics have made a similar comparison between the parts of a pipe and the parts of a lily in blossom. First comes

the bulb concealed in the earth, which they say is the invisible essence of the pipe; next the stem, which they say is the stem of the pipe; and lastly the blossom, which is the bowl of the pipe. And since there must be a lily stem before there is a lily blossom, so there must have been a pipe stem before there was a pipe bowl. But yet to this rejoin the Cœlosphaerics that by this very example of a lily which they bring forward the Orthopoetics are condemned; for since the bulb of a lily implies necessarily the idea of a blossom, therefore the essence of a pipe implies necessarily the idea of a bowl, and that as without a blossom the lily does not exist, so neither without a bowl is existence possible to a pipe.

But yet another argument of the Orthopoetics I have to lay before thee, and it is this. The Cœlosphaerics define a pipe as an instrument used in smoking tobacco. Let it be granted that the definition is valid, and it shall be proved to the satisfaction of all that the bowl is no essential part of a pipe. For take any stem of any pipe, having previously disjoined it from the bowl, and insert into one end a cigar, and place the other in your mouth. Now having applied fire to the free end of the cigar draw in the breath, which, when it is ejected from the mouth, shall be found to consist in great part of the fume of the said cigar; from which it is evident that the *stem alone* of a pipe has been used in smoking tobacco (for who will deny that a cigar is tobacco?) without the agency of a bowl. Wherefore it is proved that the bowl is not an essential part of a pipe, but only a separable accident thereof.* And from this conclusion comes

* Note here the objection of the Arabian Ebn Mascha ben Dûda:—"If instead of the cigar being placed in the stem of a pipe and the stem in the mouth, it be placed directly in the mouth, the smoke will be inhaled with as much or greater ease without any medium whatever being employed. So that neither bowl nor stem are essential parts, and a pipe therefore has no essential part, and therefore no essence. But that which has no essence has no existence; but a pipe certainly has existence, wherefore this cigar tube argument is like unto a broken hookah that will hold not rosewater, and is, indeed, *bosh lakerdi*" (empty talk.)

the corollary—that what are commonly called cigar-tubes are, in fact, pipes, for they contain in them everything essential to pipes; that they are survivals of the primitive pipes, while those which are commonly called pipes are merely amplified to suit the requirements of tobacco which is cut fine, and requires something to stay it from being drawn into the mouth; that, finally, it is evident that when tobacco was first used it was used in its most simple form, that uncut tobacco is a more simple form than cut, that therefore uncut tobacco was first used; *ergo*, the first pipes had no bowls, for bowls are for cut tobacco.

Such is the stupendous and gigantic controversy between the two Schools of Cœlosphaeric and Orthopoetic philosophers—such, at least, is a short and incomplete statement of a few of the principal points at which they join issue. For so far have I been from giving their disputations at length that here is contained not a hundredth part of the matter at my disposal. But I am like those men who transcribe the speeches in our Senate House for the diurnals, who out of an oration which hath taken two hours to deliver make a something which taketh up six lines or less of print, and all confess that it is well done. Some rash and daring spirits, indeed, would persuade us that, though it is well done to compress so far, it would be better done to omit the whole oration; but these be atheistical and blasphemous doctrines, to which I do in no wise assent. So, observing the golden mediocrity that the Venusian commends, I have touched the matter—I will not say with a needle, but with a pipe-stopper, which, be it remarked, is an image much to the purpose. For as when a man, the smoke coming with diffidence and uncertainty from his pipe, doth gently and carefully compress with a pipe-stopper the tobacco within, and lo! it burneth to admiration; so have I, in considering the contentions of these two Schools, applied the pipe-stopper of my understanding unto them. And I dare swear that as one hath said of the book writ by Immanuel Kant (I would

say the *Kritik der Reinen Vernunft*), "to read it is like going into a lighted room;" so shall men say of this book, "to read it is like going into a smoky one." And if it be indeed so said, why, *sublimi feriam vertice sidera*—I shall strike the stars with my sublime top (as Flaccus hath it).

And finally, as to the two Schools, it may not be impertinent to quote the world-renowned and much-learning-possessing Spitsbubius, called for his sublime and impenetrable cloudiness Doctor Fumificus (the Fumifical Doctor), who speaks as follows:—"With regard to the Schools of Cœlosphaeric and Orthopoetic philosophers, verily it appears to me that their several contentions are, as it were, all smoke, and that there is no essential distinction between their dogmas. For since a candle is a candle whether it be long or short, whether it have a large wick or a small wick; and a ball is a ball, whether it be large, as is a football, or small, as is a tennis-ball: so, if they will but consider, the Cœlosphaerics have but to conceive of the *stem* of the Orthopoetics as a very long *bowl* to remove all difference between them. And on the other hand the Orthopoetics have but to think of the *bowl* of the Cœlosphaerics as a very short *stem*, and they will be completely at one. And therefore since by *bowl* and *stem* they plainly mean the same thing, by much the more does glory redound to them, who have so completely proved each other's doctrines absurd and monstrous."

So far Spitsbubius, and with his words I deem fit to close the matter, but if any desire to read further let him take Papaverius Donnerblitsius's *De Naturâ Fistularum: Exercitationes Fumigabundæ* of Spitsbubius, and those excellent *Noctes Nebulosæ*, or *Foggy Nights*, of Margites Dummerkopfius, so extolled by Theodorus Wattsius in his *Minervic Disputations*. For Wattsius sayeth that it is the best done of any book that ever was writ, save only his own sonnet on the "Libellus Lavatorius, or Washerwoman's Account, of a Minor Poet of the Cave-Dwellers," lately brought to light

and edited (*cum vitâ Poetœ*) by Gossius.* For the excellence of this writer see also Moncurius Scepticus in his *Orationes Notilocellenses* (South-windy Discourses), where he interrupts himself in the midst of denouncing a certain obscure and contemptible sect called Christians to exalt and magnify this notable Dummerkopfius.

And his is certainly the most worthy to be read of all such works, for in the preface to his disquisition he giveth all that hath been said on either side since the very dawn of Pipe Philosophy, which preface extendeth to only ten volumes of the book (it having but one hundred and twenty volumes in all). And as a concluding, final, and transcendental testimony to the excellence of these *Foggy Nights* the aforesaid Wattsius can detect one *naevus* alone *in toto egregio corpore*, which is that in tom. xcix., cap. li., sect. 13, subsect. 8, a "P" hath been substituted for a "Q," which, as Wattsius justly insisteth, doth violate the first canon of the more Humane Letters—*i.e.*, "Ευλαβοῦ τὰ σὰ Π καὶ Q, or in the vulgar tongue, "Mind your 'P's' and 'Q's.'"

CHAPTER V.

Now as to the contingent unnecessary matter (*e.g.*, tobacco-jars) and impossible matter (*e.g.*, cabbage-leaves) I will say nothing. And the reason of this is that I have got nothing to say, and since I am not of sufficiently ripe experience *in arte nihil dicendi*, let this be enough; and so much for the matter of Smoking, which is the first part of this book.

* And here be it remarked that Gossius doth speak of the aforesaid poet as a "sweet singer," whence it is evident that the Cave-Dwellers were well acquainted with the science and art of music, and also that their era must be placed before the descent of the Wagnerids upon the continent of Europe, else would not their singing be sweet.

PRŒMIUM TO THE SECOND PART.

It happed that searching lately among the works of those who have writ things pertinent to this philosophy I found in the third volume of the *Noctes Nebulosæ* of Dummerkopfius some very notable and ingenious versicles that seemed to me well worthy of a place in this book, so I here annex them as a manner of Preface to my Second Part.

"The lazy Earth doth steam amain,
And fumes and smokes beneath the rain:
The Rivers, Brooks, and Rivulets are
No less in smoke particular
At nightfall: and the storm blast loud
Is often wont to *blow a cloud*
Around the Mountain-tops, and they
Do take delight in this same way;
And send a fiery fume from out
Their angry heights, and such a rout
Of burnt-up *ashes*, that do strow
Great cities in the plains below.
The *setting Sun* is oft made dim
With smoky mists that circle him.
So all the World's on *smoking* bent,
And *puffs* and *fumes* to its content:
Fill up the bowl then, fill it high,
Fill all the gaping pipes, for why
Should every creature smoke but I;
Why, man of morals, tell me why?"

This, as it seems to me, contains an exceeding just view of the subject, in so far as is compatible with the poetical and metaphorical diction, although it wants that exact and philosophical minuteness which is to be desired. But yet I esteem it of great weight in testifying to the *Macrocosmical* doctrines entertained by many and weighty doctors, notably by Vanderhorstius, *De Solutione Nebularum*, Lugd. Bat.,

1634; also by Thomas Schelsegensis, *De Gigabilitate, De Idolis Limi*, &c., so its place here is sufficiently warranted.

Now, since the First Part treated of the *matter*, it follows that the Second Part treats of the *manner*, as was observed in Chapter I. of what I have already written. What precedes, therefore, is *Absolute*, and what succeeds *Relative*, which latter member may be further divided into the following categories:—

I. Substantia. II. Ubi. III Quando. IV. Relatio.—Substance, Place, Time, and Relation.* And these categories constitute the base of this latter part, and will serve for heads, as it were, of discourse. But let it be noted with regard to substance (which might seem rather to pertain to the First Part) that we shall consider it metaphysically alone, and not physically. And as in the former Part we dissected and examined it as a chirurgeon dissects and examines the brain, so now we shall examine it as a metaphysician examines the mind.

So much, then, by way of Preface to the things which are about to be said.

* And for the assistance of unfaithful memories in the following lines these categories are illustrated and exemplified:—

> "Johannes *tabacum tubulo* nunc fumat *ad horam*
> *Nonam:* nam *cymbæ* corpus mandatur et *umbræ:*
> *Spectat et in ripis spatiantes sæpe puellas.*"

For in the first line we have Substantia "*tabacum tubulo*," and next Quando (Time), *ad nonam horam*, at 3 p.m.; thirdly, Ubi (Place), *cymbæ et umbræ*—in a boat, which is not exposed to the heat of the sun; fourthly, Relatio (Relation), *Spectat et in ripis spatiantes sæpe puellas.* And he often gazes at the girls strutting along the banks. To this last line it is objected that it is base Latinity, inasmuch as *spatior* is said to be appropriately applied when speaking of those who walk on their own property, but so much the more fitting it seems to me in the present case, since, though the river banks, doubtless, did not belong to these maidens, yet is it the custom of the female sex to walk alway with a certain insolence, and as if the whole "orbis terrarum" was subject to their pleasure.

BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

Of the four categories let substance be taken first, which having been taken let it be examined and further divided into (1) tobacco, and (2) pipes. To which division it may be objected, "Præterire aliquid maximum vitium in dividendo est"—"In division to pass over anything is a very great fault;" since many things have been omitted (jars, pouches, and the like). The reason for which omission is that all those things which have been omitted are trifling and unimportant, being *contingently unnecessary*, and not worthy of any systematic consideration. Wherefore I am constrained to censure all those (notably Gulielmus Cassiteridensis) who have ventured to differ from me in this matter as being stulti, stolidi, fatui, fungi, bardi, blenni, buccones, as Plautus hath it.

Now tobacco being the prior member of the division, let it be considered as the occasion may direct, and in such a way as will tend to the enlightenment of all. Firstly, then, it will be remembered that it was materially defined "Herba, in quâ inest nicotinica et soporifera virtus"—a herb in which there resides a nicotinic and soporific virtue. But metaphysically it is defined "Nicotinica et soporifera virtus, quæ sub tabaci specie, nostris sensibus perspicitur"—a nicotinic and soporific virtue which is evident to our senses under the form of tobacco. Hence this nicotinic virtue is an immutable and eternal idea, having a real existence; and though we know not the where, when, or how of this

existence, yet we know that it does exist. And this virtue is also named an energy, and likewise an act. But however we name it, it is evident that it has no ordinary material existence, since all tobacco which we can see, touch, and smoke must have certain accidents, such as a light colour, a strong odour, a heavy weight, and the like; also it must have come from some particular land or lands, such as Asia, America, Ægypt, and the like; yet all these are mere accidents, in no wise pertaining to our abstract notion of tobacco as metaphysically defined. This doctrine, now very generally received, was in some way shadowed forth by Pythagoras (albeit he used not the term "nicotinic," for it is of modern date), who spoke of a certain Δύναμις or *power*, corresponding to the *virtue* that was afterwards taught. And the theory we now maintain was first plainly declared by the Pundit Iradî Sânkhya, and further illustrated and exemplified by his commentator El-Mûdi. Hence arose the mystical School of Neo-Pythagoreans, who maintained that by a life of incessant smoking and meditation the philosopher might participate in the essential virtue, and comprehend its real nature. But here I will pause, and for two reasons—firstly, that I do not profess to communicate the esoteric doctrines of Pipe Philosophy; and secondly, lest, if I continue "obscurus fiam," I become obscure, and be reproved by Proctoratus Omniscientius, for that my subject-matter is not "plainly worded and exactly described," which reproof may the gods avert!

It having been granted that there exists a certain energy or virtue, let us consider by what means we may best partake of its essence and approximate to its nature. And the best method appears, in my judgment, to be smoking—*h.e.*, "fumum tabaci ore trahere," as the Schoolmen maintain, which definition, however, may be censured on the ground that it is not adequate to the thing defined. For to say that smoking is "a drawing in [inhaling] of the smoke of tobacco with the mouth," "explicat tantum partem," explains only a part both of the actual process and the abstract

idea; since the smoke cannot in the nature of things be continually inhaled without the corresponding process of exhalation; for which reason Scriblerus Redivivus appears to me more correct in defining smoking as "the sucking in of smoke at one part of the mouth, and the ejection thereof at the other." But yet he, too, goes astray in the latter part (as I think) of his definition. For I will maintain that if I suck in the smoke at the right side of my mouth and eject it, also on the right side, I have smoked. Whereas Scriblerus would seem to imply that it is necessary that the smoke should be ejected at some other part, diverse from that at which it was sucked in; whereas, so long as the smoke *is* exhaled, as far as I know, it is indifferent at what part—whether at mouth, nose, eyes, or ears. So I censure Scriblerus Redivivus for this definition of smoking, and do define it as follows:—"Smoking is the complex act by which we participate in the fumes of tobacco, and for which three things are required—(1) the inhalation of the smoke; (2) the retention thereof within the body for a space of time; (3) the exhalation of *some part* thereof from the mouth, nose, eyes, or ears taken separately or taken conjunctively."* In which definition I would direct your attention to the term "some part" as being significant, and, as far as I know, novel. For it is not necessary to smoking that the *whole* of the tobacco inhaled should be also

* Namely, from the mouth alone, as is most common; from the mouth and nose, as is not uncommon; from the mouth and ears, which is rare; from the mouth and eyes, which is rarer; or from mouth, nose, ears, and eyes all at once, which is rarest. And since Scriblerus Redivivus was of the School of Oxford, he has, doubtless, many disciples in that place who will be prepared to do battle for his cause. Wherefore I do announce, proclaim, and promise that I am ready publicly to maintain and defend this thesis in the Schools of that University—viz., "That it is wholly and completely indifferent from which aperture of the face the smoke is emitted or exhaled, or whether it be exhaled from the right side of the mouth, the left side of the mouth, or the centre of the mouth." And on this question I would dispute with the Doctor Subtilis himself, so convinced and assured am I of the truth of my assertion.

exhaled—nay, it is impossible that this is ever the case, a certain portion of each inhalation being retained within the body, on which it exerts its nicotinic virtue.

Which observation recalls our attention to the subject under discourse—namely, the best means to be employed in participating in the above-named virtue. To which question it was answered that smoking is the best means, and most adapted to the end in view. And this answer led to a precise definition of smoking (ut supra), from which definition followed the corollary that "a certain portion of each inhalation is retained within the body on which it exerts its nicotinic virtue." Hence the participation of the mind in the nicotinic energy is a mediate one, and dependent on the body. And this is the doctrine of physical participation.

To which the upholders of the doctrine of metaphysical participation object that the pleasure received is incomplete if one smoke in the dark. Whence it followeth that the watching of the smoke, as it escapes from the bowl or mouth, has a large part in the process of participation; some even going so far as to make this contemplation of the smoke the essence of participation, and the physical effect only an inseparable accident thereof. And it is alleged by many that one who smokes in total darkness knows not even whether his pipe is in or out, and will often continue inhaling contentedly his own breath, his pipe containing nought but burnt-out ashes. But if this doctrine were true then it follows that to view others smoking would be an equal pleasure to smoking oneself, which if it were so smoking would shortly become a thing of the past (since who would be at the expense to buy tobacco when he could have the same pleasure by merely watching another smoking?) Also, if tobacco produces no physical sensations, any one of the weakest stomach would be free to smoke the strongest tobacco by the hour, provided only that he either bandaged his eyes or smoked in darkness. And this being granted as possible (argumenti causâ) leads us necessarily to the con-

clusion that the sensation of nausea, which undoubtedly does sometimes result from the use of tobacco, is caused alone by the disturbance to the eye, caused by viewing the clouds of smoke in the air. Furthermore, since the clouds arising from Cavendish and the Turkish tobacco are exactly the same in appearance, it follows that nausea is no more likely to result from the use of the one than the other, which is to say that they are both of an equal strength. But this, as any one of my readers can ascertain for himself, is a falsity, Cavendish tobacco being, at the least, double the strength of Turkish tobacco. Hence, since the proposition, "All sensations experienced in smoking are due to the sight of the smoke," has been proved to be false, its contradictory must be true—that is, "Some sensations experienced in smoking are not due to the sight of the smoke."

And this being established on the firm ground of logical inference, I will at once grant that smoking in darkness is a most unsatisfactory and incomplete process, affording very little pleasure at the best of times, and frequently none at all. And the reason is this—namely, "Some sensations experienced in smoking *are* due to the sight of the smoke," which I account for as follows:—The reception of the smoke into the body acts in two modes—firstly, directly upon the body. And to this first mode are to be referred nausea and sickness as resulting directly from it, and having no connection with the sight of the smoke in the air. Secondly, through the body indirectly on the mind, in which it excites certain sensations and dispositions. Now one of these dispositions is a pleasure in watching the clouds of smoke as they rise, and a desire to do so. Hence if it be dark and the smoke invisible this desire is ungratified, and the pleasure reduced. So in proportion to the virtue of the tobacco is the disappointment experienced, seeing that the more virtuous it be the more does it stir up this desire of beholding the smoke. But the effect upon the body remains entirely the same, being less or greater according to the stomach of the smoker or his habitude to smoking. Such

is the explanation of diminution (or even extinction) of pleasure in smoking in the dark.

Now the next question is—how to account for a total absence of *all* sensation whatever under these conditions. And, firstly, we must inquire if such is the fact, unless we would imitate those erudite members of the Royal Society in the reign of our second Charles of ever blessed and glorious memory. And as far as I am able to judge, using both the experience of myself and that of others, I reply that it is a fact, but one that only is manifest in particular cases and under particular circumstances, which are such as follow:—(1.) He who smokes must have been in the habit of so doing for some years. (2.) He must use always the same kind of tobacco. (3.) He must use always the same kind of pipe. (4.) He must smoke at the same time of day at which he has been aforetime wont to smoke. Now let such a one fill his accustomed pipe with his accustomed tobacco, and if it be daylight let his eyes be blindfolded, and if it be night let the lamps be put out, and in such case I should not at all be astonished to hear him declare that he knows not whether his pipe be in or out. But on the other hand, if any one of the four conditions laid down should be violated, then, if I mistake not, the result would be different, and though the pleasure of smoking would be either entirely absent or greatly reduced, still there would be a complete physical appreciation of the act. And from the whole of the above discourse it appears that participation in the energy (or virtue) is composite, partly proceeding from physical influence on the body, partly from dispositions in the mind, one of which dispositions is gratified by the sight of the smoke in the air. And such other more remote sensations of the mind will be treated of under *Relation* at full length.

Next it will be profitable to take a brief view of the principal kinds of tobacco, with their several distinguishing properties.

Cavendish.—A good tobacco, I confess, strong, hearty,

and wholesome, well adapted to vivify the mind and confirm the body; cool and pleasant to the mouth, and grateful to the stomachs of such as be used to it. Nathless, caution should be observed in its exhibition, lest by reason of its vigour it breed bile and loathing. So, if any one be about to use it for the first time, I would recommend that it be admixed with some milder kind, such as is Honeydew or Birdseye.

Birdseye.—A pleasant and fragrant tobacco, adapted for common use by all; not lacking savour, but not too vigorous. Yet is it apt to be hot and fretful in the mouth, so let such as be at all tender in that part use it but sparingly.

Honeydew.—Honeydew is cool and bland in the mouth and mild of digestion, yet by itself it wants fragrance and savour, and by reason of that want fails to stimulate, as it ought, both body and mind, but as I have noted, admixed with Cavendish it is mighty pleasant and delightsome.

Turkish.—A hot, tasteless tobacco, little fitted for the pipe, and incapable of good admixture, yet in it (if it be the best) there is a certain faint fragrance which some do much admire.

Returns.—A strong, rank tobacco, without fragrance or pleasant taste. Hot to the mouth, it breeds bile, and is to be avoided, unless by such as are veteran smokers.

Shag.—Like in all respects to Returns, save that it is ranker and more choleric. This tobacco I commend to none, and wish it were altogether abolished, since by its fumes much discredit is brought on tobacco in general.

Latakia.—Of itself a tasteless tobacco, or at least when smoked in pipes of European fashion, but useful for admixture with stronger tobaccos, and (as I am told) pleasantly to be smoked in a hookah or water-pipe.

Virginia.—Exceeding hot and biting in the mouth, and so to be condemned, yet of a most delicate and delightful fragrance, in which I think no tobacco surpasses it. Also

of a fair strength, but a quick burner, and so dear to use.*

Such are the principal kinds of tobacco in use amongst us, which may either be taken separately or combined in various proportions as the taste of the smoker may direct. And so various is this taste that to lay down any one kind or admixture as good for all times and for all persons were impossible, yet I may roughly and conjecturally say that those who smoke for the love of smoking will smoke Cavendish, Birdseye, or Honeydew, while those who smoke because they think it adds to the beauty of their countenances will smoke Latakia, Turkish, or Virginia. But these are mostly, as Sir Thomas Schelsegensis maintains, clothes-horses, and not men in any rational sense of the term. And as to admixture I would commend that, of which half-a-pound being taken, four ounces shall consist of Honeydew, one of Birdseye, and three of Cavendish, the Honeydew contributing blandness, the Birdseye fragrance, and the Cavendish strength. And this must be said in favour of admixtures—that by smoking several kinds of tobacco in combination the student approximates more nearly to the universal energy than if he smoke one kind alone, for it is to be considered that each sort has its peculiar excellences and its peculiar defects, whence by mixing several sorts in such a proportion that the excellences are combined in a harmony and the defects or vices annulled, we are near to that ideal tobacco possessing every conceivable excellence and no conceivable vice.

So much, then, for the various kinds of Tobacco, the properties thereof, and the combinations thereof. Now Smalgruelius, in the Appendix to his work *De Omnibus Rebus*,

* Hence the memorial lines:—

Latakia, et Turkish, Returns, Virginia, Birdseye,
Shag, Honeydew, Cavendish:—omnia fumifera.

It is doubted whether these be the lines in the mind of the poet when he speaks of a "most burlesque, barbarous experiment." This I leave to the consideration of the curious in such matters.

entitled *De Quibusdem Aliis*, at the beginning of the chapter *De Rebus Hypotheticis*, has these words:—"Anything which can be applied to some use, and, on being so applied, is incapable of being used again, is said to exist in three modes, namely—I. Privation. II. Position. III. Negation. *Exempli gratiâ* coal, which before it is burnt exists in privation; when it is burning, in position; and when it is burnt to ashes, in negation. Such substance is said to be determinate. And anything which is capable of being applied to some use, and on being applied continues its usefulness to infinity, is said to exist in two modes only, namely—I. Privation. II. Continuation. *Exempli gratiâ* stone, which, when it is in the quarry, exists in privation; but when it is shapen into a pyramid, in continuation. Such substance is said to be continuous. Thirdly, anything which is capable of being applied to some use, and on being applied vanishes utterly out of our sight, is said to exist in three modes, namely—I. Privation. II. Position. III. Extinction. *Exempli gratiâ* oil, which, when it is unlighted, exists in privation; when it is in the state of being employed in giving light, in position; and when, the oil being consumed, the lamp goes out, in extinction. Such substance is said to be indeterminate. Fourthly, anything which is capable of being applied to some use, and, on being applied to that use, continues its usefulness for a greater or less amount of time, but then becomes incapable of being so applied any longer, is said to exist in three modes, namely—I. Privation. II. Continuation. III. Negation. *Exempli gratiâ* wood, which, when alive and growing, exists in privation; when shapen into a beam, in continuation, and when, having in the course of years become rotten, it falls to pieces, in negation. Such substance is said to be temporary. Some, however, would deny that any substance can be properly placed in this class, since it only differs from determinate substance in continuing in position a longer time, which (they allege) is no sufficient differentia. And aught that cannot be placed in

some one of these four classes, or partly in one and partly in another, is insoluble and unknowable (est insolubile et inscibile), which substances I have considered under the head *De Insolubilibus* in the former part of this work."* So far Smalgruelius, whom I have quoted, partly from the curiosity and rareness of his book and partly for the application of his words to our subject-matter. Under which class, then, shall we place tobacco—Determinate, Continuous, Indeterminate, or Temporary? Let us consider, then, the classes in their order and endeavour to resolve this matter. And firstly let it be Determinate. Now, determinate substance has three modes—privation, position, and negation, and tobacco before it is kindled with fire may be said to exist in privation. Next, being alight and in the condition of being smoked, it plainly exists in position. And when it has been reduced to ashes and the pipe is out it exists in negation, since the ashes cannot ever be applied to the use of being smoked. So far good; and since tobacco is evidently neither continuous—*i.e.*, lasting to infinity—nor temporary—*i.e.*, lasting for a long course of years—nor yet indeterminate, for it does not vanish out of our sight, but leaves ashes, we may with safety declare it to be determinate, existing in the three modes above-named.

This granted, let us consider tobacco existing in privation, that is, before it is placed in position—*id est*, combustion. Now, since the whole universe and all contained in it may by a comprehensive dichotomy be divided into that which belongs to oneself and that which does not, it appears plain that all the tobacco in the world may be, as far as I am concerned, also divided into that which I have and that which I have not. (And I may remark, by the way, that at this moment I possess about four ounces of the herb to set

* In confirmation of this theory I am able to adduce Ammonius *De Interpretatione.* "τὸ μὲν ξύλον ἐστι φύσει, ἡ δὲ θύρα θέσει"= timber exists naturally (privatively), but a door in *position.* But he only starts, as it were, the notion which Smalgruelius amplifies, and which, if time allow, I do myself intend to amplify to a still greater extent.

against the other somewhat larger member of the dichotomy —that which I have not.) But before I can smoke it is necessary that I do practically make this dichotomy—that is, become possessed of some tobacco for my own use and enjoyment. And to this possession there are four ways—*borrowing*, *begging*, *buying*, *stealing*, any or each of which are open to the would-be dichotomiser and fumigator. And let these four methods be taken in their order and considered. Firstly, *borrowing*, which I perceive is defined in the dictionary "to ask upon loan," "to take for use," neither of which definitions I am able to accept, for many do "ask upon loan" but yet receive nought save refusals, which is not borrowing but endeavouring to borrow; and many do "take things for use" without going through the pain of asking the owner's consent. But this we name stealing, and those amongst us who are unwilling to use harsh words concerning their fellowmen conveying, which is plainly not borrowing. Let borrowing, then, be defined as "the asking for and obtaining anything on loan"—that is, with the intention of restoring it, or its equivalent, back. And provided this intention of restoring be really present, and afterwards carried into effect, I do highly commend this way of getting tobacco as likely to give the borrower a more universal taste in the herb, since if he borrow from many friends it is probable that he borrows, and likewise smokes, many sorts of tobacco. But if this intention of restoring be altogether absent, or if present never resulting in action, then it is no longer *borrowing* but *sponging*, a hateful and detestable practice, of which certain students at the University of Oxford did show their abhorrence in coining the future tense of a verb Σμωκμιφρενζονήζω, to express a fellow who was notable for such parasitical champetry. Such a "sponge" will walk into another's rooms with a cheerful smile and "Heus! amice," or "Οὗτος συ," "Hullo! old fellow," it matters not which, and before he has tarried long out comes his pipe, and with some lame excuse of having forgotten his pouch, or the like, will dive deep into

the tobacco-jar, and calling for ale, will play the host most gallantly—at another's expense. Off with such blood-suckers from the face of the earth! say I—"a twenty devil way," as old Chaucer hath it. So much for *borrowing*.

Next let us take *begging*, which differeth from borrowing in that he who begs neither *pre*tends nor *in*tends to pay back that which he has borrowed, but sues of your mercy and kindness to grant him his request. And this way of obtaining tobacco is practised chiefly by such lewd folk as do loiter about the streets and market-places "seeking what they may devour." And since any one who has reached this point of my discourse must be of far too obstinate, pigheaded, and determined a nature ever to come to begging tobacco it were unprofitable to continue the matter further; and whether it be profitable or not, this is all I shall say on the question.

Next cometh *buying*, which meaneth to give the coins of the realm in exchange for that thou buyest. Now, *buying* may be regarded in three ways—firstly, the place where you buy; secondly, the price at which you buy; and thirdly, those from whom you buy. Now, the place where you buy is sometimes designated a tobacco-shop, but more frequently a "divan" or a "cigar stores." And the meaning of the word "divan" is that what would in nature be the sitting-room of the shopkeeper has been fitted up with hard chairs and harder benches and some stony tripods, answering in some respects to tables. Here, by the payment of a shilling, you may smoke a bad cigar and drink a bad cup of coffee, reading meanwhile an obsolete paper. Happy is the man who between this den and the word "divan" can establish any connection. He should be writing this book, not I. Secondly, the price at which you buy may be either a great price, a moderate price, or a small price. For example, of the first take Turkish tobacco at twenty-five shillings the pound; of the second, Birdseye tobacco at six shillings the pound; and of the third, Shag tobacco at four shillings the pound. And in this, as in other matters,

wisdom lies in the mean, for he who buys tobacco at a great price needs a long purse, and he who buys it at a small price a strong stomach, but if he observe the mean he need have neither. Thirdly, those from whom you buy, the best division of whom is into male and female. Now the male seller of tobacco is of various sorts, of which take for example (1) the man of many words. From such a one you have much talking concerning all matters in general, especially if he be from foreign lands, which lands he doth not fail greatly to commend, but yet hath no desire to return unto them; (2) the man of few words, whose sole topic is the weather; (3) the man of no words, who selleth thee tobacco as if thou wast doing him an injury, and taketh thy money with a forbidding countenance. Yet if thou givest him no money is his countenance yet more forbidding, which is strange and with difficulty to be explained. For since the contradictory of receiving *some* money is receiving no money, and likewise the contradictory of a forbidding countenance a cheerful countenance, so rightly in such case should this man's countenance be cheerful; but yet it is not so, the reason whereof has not yet been discovered.

Next take the female sellers of tobacco, whose very existence I consider an insult to the smoker. For as it is not the habit of females in this country to smoke needs must be that such ones do sell that of which they know nothing and on which they are not qualified to discriminate. And this want of knowledge they endeavour to replace by idle verbosities and foolish grimaces wherewith to please the clothes-horses who may frequent their shop. Yet let it not be thought that they have any pretensions to a pleasant wit or pointed understanding, for I myself, being in company with one whose fault it was to have too great a fondness for these harpies, did list to a conversation lasting above an hour, in which I avow no one sensible, pleasant, or humorous word did pass, the talk being like unto ditchwater. And what pleasure he who calls himself a man can find in such

discourse I know not, but am willing to be instructed on the matter. So much for buying tobacco.

Fourthly and lastly, it is possible to obtain tobacco by *stealing*, to which there is the one objection that the law will not suffer it, and if by means of "bobbies" it can apprehend the stealer will deprive him of both tobacco and liberty for a greater or less period. Otherwise I can see no objection to this method, it being devoid of all expense and being capable of much dexterity in the application. But unless thou possess a quick hand and a swift foot I do not recommend the direct or *ostensive* method of stealing. But would advise that which is called indirect or per accidens, which is thus accomplished:—By much pains discover a tobacco-shop where the folk seem of a simple and confiding nature, and for some weeks make frequent purchases thereat, paying for all that thou receivest in good and immediate coin. And when thou hast established that confidence which is so much to be desired between man and man it is an easy matter to slide (as it were) into disbursing for that thou hast received at longer and longer intervals, and finally into disbursing not at all. And thus is mere *buying* converted per accidens into *stealing*, and that without any risk or harm to the stealer.

So much for the four ways of becoming possessed of tobacco, to which some do add a fifth—namely, presentation, in which you receive it without request on your part and without the understanding that it is in any way to be repaid the presenter, but by free gift. But this is a very rare and phenomenal occurrence; nay, men have doubted whether there is such a thing as a gift at all, thinking to detect in every gift (so called) a certain sub-audition by which the giver implies that he expects some manner of repayment. This question I leave open, only observing that as there are four ways of becoming possessed of tobacco so there are four ways of becoming dispossessed of it—namely, by being borrowed of, by being begged of, by being bought of, and by being robbed of, of which only the third is to be com-

mended, as leading to profit, while the others are at the best doubtful and mostly to be avoided.

And having by one or all of these methods obtained possession of the required tobacco, nothing remains but to smoke it, of which process somewhat hath already been said, and somewhat more shall presently be noted, but for the present let the matter of tobacco be deemed at an end.

CHAPTER II.

Now in the former part of this treatise, amidst other definitions, a pipe was defined thus:—Instrumentum per quod tabaci fumus ore trahitur—an instrument by which the smoke of tobacco is inhaled—which definition is well adapted for that material portion of Pipe Philosophy in which it has been placed. But for our present purposes it will be better defined as "That by which it is possible for tobacco to have position or positive existence;" which it will readily be perceived is a more abstract and metaphysical statement than the former. A pipe, then, is a thing instrumental to our participation in the energy developed by tobacco in the state of positive existence. Now all will acknowledge that of pipes some are good, some bad, and some indifferent; let it be ours to inquire in what a pipe's excellence or goodness consists, and what kind of pipe is most likely to possess this excellence. Now a pipe that is excellent in all respects is a rare and precious thing, not to be acquired every day, and deserving of much attention when possessed. And as in the former part the principal division was into simple and complex (quoad materiam), so here the principal division will be into long and short (quoad formam). Of this I esteem the long pipe as on the whole the best, and, in a word, the most adapted for the philosopher; my reason for so doing being that there is a certain pleasure in viewing the clouds of smoke rising from the bowl at a distance from the smoker, which pleasure the short pipe cannot afford. And it having been proved that this viewing of the smoke is one of the most important, and at the same time mysterious, pleasures which it is in the power of tobacco to afford, it is evident that a pipe

which increaseth the force of this pleasure is most to be commended. Further, long pipes are divided into four classes, clay, china, wooden, water or hookah pipe. The first of these, clay, is that kind usually known as a churchwarden, either because it bears the same relation to ordinary pipes as a churchwarden does to the common herd of men, or because churchwardens, with that subtle understanding for which they have always been noted, perceiving the dignity of the pipe, determined to make use of it, and so by its being used by them it got the name. However that may be, it is in many ways a dignified and noble pipe, gracefully curved and pleasant in the mouth. But yet it is easily broken, and does not feel secure in the hand; having, besides, a very small bowl, requiring to be filled often, and very soon being exhausted.

Secondly, by the china pipe I mean those which are separable into three parts—namely, the stem, the bowl, and a third part joining the two, and acting as a reservoir for such liquor as may collect. And this is a pipe to be beheld with reverence and awe; for is it not the very tubulus philosophorum Germanicorum—the pipe of German philosophers? Have I not with mine own eyes seen the mighty Spitsbubius in his study holding such a pipe in his hand, and filling it from a mighty jar beside him? Is not the pipe used by the gigantic Dummerkopfius in the compilation of his *Noctes Nebulosæ* at this present moment to be seen in the Museum of Berlin? And doth it not hold two ounces at the least? Yea, verily it doth, and is a pipe to rejoice the heart of Νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς himself. Happy is he who, possessing such an instrument, fashions his life and conversation agreeably to the same.

Next cometh the long wooden pipe, which, though not hallowed by the names of mighty men, is nathless much to be lauded for its coolness to the mouth and adaptability to the hand. Consisting wholly of wood, it is hard to be broken, in this respect being superior to the churchwarden. Also it hath commonly a large and rotund bowl, pleasing

to the eye, and holding much tobacco. And if, in addition to these merits, it hath a flexible joining near to the mouthpiece, so that it may be bent to any direction, it seems to me to approach very near to perfection. But let it be noted that the wood from bowl to mouthpiece be sound and good, which wanting it becomes an abomination, transmuting good tobacco into vile and execrable mundungus.

Last of the long pipes, properly so called, comes the hookah or water pipe. But if this is to be smoked well it must be with its appropriate tobacco, prepared in the orthodox manner, and lighted and kept burning by charcoal. Wherefore he who smokes a hookah should have a slave whose sole duty is the care thereof, else is it a weariness, and productive rather of pain than pleasure. But if the slave understand his office well, then shall it give thee joy, both by reason of the twistings and writhings of the tube and the sight of the smoke curling forth at so great a distance. Wherefore, when I shall become possessed of gold and silver in abundance, I will build me a house with a great hall about the size of a tennis-court. And at one end there shall be a dais, with cushions of precious stuff in the Eastern manner, whereon I will sit me down. But at the other, nigh unto the roof, shall be a gallery with mighty hookahs thereon, the least of which shall hold a full pound of tobacco. And from them, in many twining convolutions, shall their tubes go forth, yea, even unto the cushioned dais shall they go; and seated there with my friends I shall truly smoke and partake of the real and divine energy. But since at the present I have neither gold nor silver, nor apes nor peacocks, I will content me with wood and clay, and receive from them such pleasaunce as they will afford.

Now these being the principal kinds of long pipes, next follow the short pipes, of which there are two divisions, clay and wood. And to all short pipes pertain the following excellences:—(1) They are light in the mouth, and do not drag out one's teeth before their time to be dragged out has come. (2) They give no trouble to the hands. (3) They

may be smoked abroad, whether in the city or the country. And in this last particular they plainly surpass the long pipes, which it is impossible to use *sub Dio*, at least in this land of ours. Now the wooden pipes are subdivided into an infinite variety of forms, and also a great variety of matter, according to the different species of wood that are wont to be used in their confection. As to form, I do most commend those with a large and rotund bowl and a wide mouthpiece. Let the stem also be straight, for in a short pipe a bent and curling stem *non est virtus sed vitium*—is a blemish and not an excellence. Let the stem likewise be thick and sturdy, of one part with the bowl, and provided with a strong mouthpiece, of some good sort of bone. So that as a fellow-Silurian once observed to me of his favourite pipe, "If thou sittest on this pipe, thou, and not the pipe, wilt be the sufferer." And this saying came not to him by chance or fortuity, but had been handed down from Jestyn ap Gwrgan, his ancestor, the bowl of whose pipe was even a hollow rock, and the stem thereof a young pine-tree. And when the clouds of heaven, hanging low, obscure the mountains from the eyes of men, then they say that Jestyn is smoking his pipe; which whether it be true I dare not pronounce, but am inclined to believe it possible.

Such being our demonstration of short wooden pipes, let us next advance to short clay pipes, which may be arranged under two heads—namely, clay proper, as the term is commonly understood, and meerschaum, which is a finer and better sort of clay. Now it will be remembered that in the former part of this tract in my synopsis of pipes and in the definitions preceding that synopsis mention was made of "ornament" and "essential colour," and it was explained that the term "ornament" denoted that the surface of a pipe was not smooth and plane, but in all or singular of its parts raised or embossed. And "essential colour" signified that by the art of the maker any colour or colours had been affixed to the pipe to which the term might be applied. Now it is a point much in dispute among philosophers

whether it is better that a pipe should be smooth as to its surface, or, on the other hand, be enriched with carving. And for my part I do pronounce that the only way in which carving is profitable is when the bowl of the pipe is made into the similitude of a human head, especially if the head be of that kind known as a skull, the contemplation of which cannot fail to be profitable and agreeable. And if the smoker will but propose to himself that the skull he is smoking is that of a woman, he will, if he think the matter over, be much edified and instructed. And this for two reasons—firstly, that a woman is being turned to some use, which is seldom the case, and when it does occur should be welcomed with joy; and secondly, that by gazing upon this woman's skull he may better learn to despise and abhor the faces of those women who are alive. For let these faces of flesh be as enticing and beautiful as you please, skulls they are, and ere long skulls they will be, devoid of those graces which have lured many an honest man to shame and destruction—yea, even unto breaking of pipes and burning of cigars for love of a face, than which no shame can be greater or more flagitious. So much for ornament, and as to essential colour I confess I like it not, save that it be used very sparingly, and so as to make of greater effect that "accidental" colour which thy persistent smoking may impart.

Now the merits of short clay pipes are these: (1) They are light and easy to be carried in the mouth; (2) they are "an insult to decent society"—I considering "decent society" as a filthy and obscene harridan which every *man* does well to trample on and defy; (3) they, after long smoking, become saturated with tobacco, and so excellently sweet. But yet they are of all pipes most easy to be broken, as much for their smallness as their brittle texture. For two things being equally brittle, but one larger than the other, the larger will endure, since every one can see it, and so is 'ware of breaking it; but the smaller is apt to escape the sight, and so be destroyed unawares. Wherefore a short clay pipe is more likely to be broken than a church-

warden. Further, unless the clay be really of the best, they are very noxious, and apt to breed bile and black choler. And of all bad pipes a bad clay pipe is surely the worst. Therefore let the catechumen in smoking be chary of using them lest they become a Stumbling-Block to him and a cause of offence. With regard to meerschaums I would remark one thing, and one only. Be not misled in buying them by a pleasant appearance and outward show of a soft and creamy lustre. For all these are easy to be simulated by cunning men, whom I blame not, but those deceived by such devices. But if thou wouldest test whether it be a true meerschaum hold it in thine hand and try it by its weight. For true meerschaum is exceeding light and clay heavy. And this is a certain proof.

Such being the principal kinds of pipes, next cometh the question which is the best to possess. And if we were tied by an authority to choose one alone and smoke it perpetually I know not how I should answer, since each pipe has peculiar virtues, and not one possesses them all. But this not being the case I give the following five kinds as meet to be smoked, at different times, and in different cases: (1) A short wooden pipe of that stubborn sort which was commended. And this for general use in the open air and in rough walking. (2) A long wooden pipe with a bulbous bowl and a flexible stem. And this to be used in the house, and convenient for meditation. (3) A short clay pipe, plain and without adornment. And this to be used in the parks and public places for the insulting of Fools. (4) A skull's-head pipe of white clay or meerschaum. And this to be used when in danger of falling in love, or being beguiled by "the monster woman," as Master Abraham Cowley hath it. (5) A china pipe of the German fashion, as described. And this to be used in the study of ancient tongues and bygone things, or in reading books of German philosophy.

And concerning the various sorts of pipes, their excellences, their vices, and the uses of each sort, let such things have been said.

Now it having been shown that each pipe is appropriate to a certain disposition of the mind, from which ariseth the questions—Do certain pipes produce certain dispositions, or do certain dispositions produce certain pipes?—that is to say, are the influences which are undoubtedly exerted by pipes inherent in them, or are they only the results of association? On this point much dispute has arisen; for it is maintained, on the one hand, by Smalgruelius that men are moved to read German philosophy by smoking German pipes, which (he insists) have a certain occult influence on the mind owing chiefly to the strange arrangement and shape of the bowl, and also to the manner in which they are held. To him consents Arnoldus, who declares the abstract idea of German pipes to be "An eternal not ourselves that makes for cloudiness." But, on the other hand, Stoschius will have it that men are not Irish navvies because they smoke short black pipes, but smoke short black pipes because they are Irish navvies, which being a knotty point I leave for the solution of my readers, and trust they may come to a satisfactory conclusion thereon.

Next cometh the question whether pipes can ever begin to be, or ever cease to exist. Now in the *Organum Novissimum* it is thus argued that pipes have no beginning:—"All matter has existed from eternity, all pipes are matter—*ergo*, all pipes have existed from eternity," which seems indeed to be a true and valid syllogism in Barbara. And foreseeing that some might object to the major premiss as contrary to religion, it has been put in this form:—Since matter first existed no matter has been destroyed; but pipes are matter, therefore, since matter first existed, no pipes have been destroyed—*i.e.*, pipes have existed from the beginning of time. But notwithstanding the force of this argument Dummerkopfius does not hesitate to pronounce it "*crassa et putida æquivocatio, et nihil amplius*"—a crass and putid equivocation, and nothing more.

On the other hand, those who affirm that it is impossible that a pipe should ever cease to exist argue as follows:—

That which exists cannot cease to exist (since matter is indestructible). A pipe exists! therefore a pipe is indestructible, whence, combining these two conclusions, we determine that pipes have neither a beginning nor ending, which determination cannot fail to produce a calm and equable habit of the mind. For example, yesterday, having the wherewithal, thou didst buy a meerschaum, cunningly and rarely adorned, as if from the very hands of Dædalus, giving, in exchange for it, much gold. And to-day, meeting a friend, in the pride and joy of thine heart thou didst, without delay, pull it forth to exhibit it, and have much honour thereby. But, alas! it slipped from thine hands, and, falling on the stone, was broken and shattered beyond all mending. Nathless grieve not, for hath it not been proved that a pipe is a thing indestructible, and lasting for ever? And though to the eye of sense thy pipe appears to have been destroyed, yet, transcendentally, it doubtless exists unaltered, and will always so exist. And if, upon reading this, the circumstance do really occur as I have related, and thou still wilt persist to repine and cry aloud, Αἰ Αἰ; then shalt thou be accounted a pitiful dolt and loghead, possessed of the Divine reason, but yet not exercising it.

This matter being fully determined and made clear, I would next draw the attention of the studious to a mysterious and doubtful point, by the consideration of which many have become sorely poddered and confounded. And it is this:—Whether, supposing any one to dream of a pipe or of smoking, the pipe that has been dreamt of has any real existence? And the same with regard to the tobacco smoked, the smoke thereof, and the ashes thereof. Now in the judgment of the Rosicrucians pipe, tobacco, ashes, and smoke do verily exist—nay, are more real than the pipes we smoke in our waking hours, which are, indeed, but shadows and similitudes adapted for our material nature, but in no proper sense of the word real. On this see *The Rosicrucians*, editio altera, p. 116, where the following words

may be found:—"But to the questions, what is a dream?—nay, what is waking?—who shall answer? or who can declare whether in that broad outside, where our minds and our powers evaporate and cease, where nature melts away into nothing that we can know as nature, or know as anything else, in regard to dreams and realities, the one may not be the other? The dream may be man's life to him—as another life other than his own life—and the reality may be the dream, . . . while we, awake as we fancy ourselves, may be sunk in a sleep of many thousand years." κ.τ.λ. So, it being granted that our dream life is more real than our waking life, the conclusion followeth of necessity that our dream pipes are more real than our waking pipes. Wherefore the whole array of material pipes is, as it were, doubled and confronted by a spiritual host of spiritual pipes, existing in some world we know not of, and to be smoked alone in dreams. To what boundless realms of thought doth this lead us, and what manifold deductions might be drawn therefrom! May not each one of us, from the days of Adam Kadmon to now, have each a patron pipe, as it were, allotted to him, bearing a mysterious relation to his natural habit of mind and body? Hence the pipes a man smokes and his occupation and station may not entirely be disconnected, as Stoschius supposes—*e.g.*, it may be in some part true that A is an Irish navvy because he uses a short clay, and X is a man of wealth because he smokes a meerschaum. But of a truth this theory of dream pipes is altogether too deep a matter to be merely handled in so small a treatise, so I do but give hints and outlines, which the reader may fill in for himself as it pleaseth him.

Next I will notice those sophisms or fallacies with which Pipe Philosophers are wont, on occasion, to divert themselves. And, for example, take the following, by which it has been shown that smoking is impossible. To smoke is to inhale tobacco, but to do this it is necessary for the mouthpiece of the pipe to come in contact with the lips. And suppose that the mouthpiece of the pipe about to be smoked is a

foot distant from the lips, then move it so that it becomes nearer by a half; then again move it nearer by a quarter, and then by an eighth, and so on. By which it will continually come more and more near to the mouth, but yet will never touch it. But since it is necessary in smoking for the mouthpiece to touch the mouth, smoking is impossible. This against the possibility of smoking, but against the utility of smoking take the following:—

"If you smoke cigars you cause expense (to yourself).

If you smoke pipes you cause offence (to others).

But you must smoke one or the other, *therefore* it is best not to smoke."

And this being the composition of a sophist, who sold it at a great price to a certain Anti-Smoking Association, was confuted as follows by the author of this book in his *Disputationes MD Contra Lawsonum*:—

"If I smoke pipes I shall please myself.

If I smoke cigars I shall please others.

Therefore it is best to smoke."

And many other ingenious arguments of this kind are there, which I omit, they pertaining rather to the eristical art than the fumifical, properly so called.

And this is all that I shall say on the matter of pipes.

CHAPTER III.

THE second category of place admits of two divisions—the place where not and the place where. For example of the first take, in past time, Socrates; in present time, Mr. Isaac Pitman; in future time, the perfect man of Herbert Spencer, all of whom have smoked, smoke, and will smoke in the place where they are not, or, in more common language, nowhere. It has, indeed, been asserted that it is impossible for any one to smoke in the place where he is not, but the above examples plainly prove the contradictory, which to all rational men is a self-evident and axiomatic proposition. But as to the manner in which it is accomplished, and as to the pipes which are used (in smoking where you are not), this I may not manifest, it being one of those secret doctrines known only to a few, and unmeet to be revealed. But he who in a reverent and devout spirit shall apply himself to the study of the Pythagorean hymn "Unus, Duo: Soccum Fibulato" (One, Two: Buckle my Shoe), may, by a perception of the mystic numbers therein contained, arrive at an understanding of this matter. For if he can but become a "pontifex" or "bridge-maker" between the limitable (one) and the illimitable (two), and clearly perceive how it comes to pass that "twice one are two," then indeed the buckling of the shoe is an easy task. But this knowledge is not for the many, and is hard to be got. Now I imagine that I perceive many a one who has hitherto read with patience, and it may be not without edification, now fling the book down and scornfully declare that he who thinks it a hard matter to understand "twice one are two" is not fitted to read books, much less to write them. But yet, O Cato, dost thou thyself understand this? Tell me

not that it so because the multiplication-table declares it to be so; for that is but saying, "It is so because it is so." Neither use long words such as "unity" and "duality," for they are but one and two in Roman togas. Neither talk of experience, and endeavour to explain the mystery by telling me that "twice one are two" because twice one shilling is two shillings. For there was a time when there were neither shillings, nor denarii, nor drachmas—nay, nor men to possess them, nor a world for men to dwell in; yet, then as now, it might have been written in space, "Twice one are two."

This being all that I shall write concerning smoking in the place where you are not, I will next treat of that kind of smoking more commonly practised—namely, in the place where you are. And the different divisions of place where I have exhibited in the form of a "tree," partly after that known as "Arbor Porphyriana," but differing from it as to matter.

By this synopsis we perceive that place where is capable of two main divisions—in the open air and indoors. The open air or hypæthral division may be further divided into celestial (in the air), terrestrial (on land), and aqueous (on water). Now it is possible to smoke in the air in two ways —in a balloon and out of a balloon, which last, though it is practicable and, perchance, pleasurable, I do not think has ever been accomplished, and this is doubtless due to the mind being in such cases taken up by the consideration of other matters. It will be seen that the terrestrial member is not further subdivided, which omission is not to be imputed to inability or ignorance on my part, but to an unwillingness to occupy the space that would be required, any further subdivision amounting to a description of the habitable world. The aqueous member, however, is here fully partitioned into its several sections, all of which are too commonly known to require particular discourse. I will, nathless, observe that if any one should sit in a boat-house on the shore of a Scotch *loch* through which a river


PLACE.
Hypæthral.
[In the Open Air.]
Anæthral.
[Indoors.]
In the Air.
On Land.
On Water.
In a Room.
In a Balloon.
Out of a Balloon.
On the Sea.
On a River.
On a Lake.
In a Chair.
On a Bed.
In a Bed.
On the Floor.
On the Table.
In a Ship.
In a Boat.
In the Water.
In a Boat.
In the Water.
Under a Bed.
Under the Table.
Half on Land, and Half in the Water.
Half in the Open Air and Half Indoors.
In a Boat House.
In a Summer House.

flows into the sea he will (provided the *loch* be proximate to the open sea) be smoking in as composite a manner as is possible. For let him, though sitting on the floor of the boat-house, dip his legs into the water, and at the same moment he will be partly indoors and partly in the open air, partly on the land and partly on water, partly on the sea, partly on a river, and partly on a lake. So much for hypæthral or open-air smoking. Next for anæthral or indoor smoking, for all general purposes it is sufficient to say that it always implies the being in a room, the which is further subdivided into possible positions in that room. Of these I most commend smoking in bed, but do advise that the pipe smoked be a long one, and would caution the reader to have all things necessary for smoking to hand, for the jumping out of bed to get a light is plainly contrary to sound reason. And if any one should require a demonstration of this let him read the *Great Morals* of Aristotle, who leaveth no doubt whatever on the subject. And as by a careful study of the above "tree" it is easy to get at all the maxims relating to place where, I will not give them at length, but only a few by way of example, such as the following:—I. Super mensam et sub mensâ eodem tempore fumare, impossibile est. To smoke on the table and under the table at the same time is impossible. II. Qui fumat in æthere, non fumat in aquâ. He who smokes in the air does not smoke in the water. III. Tribunis sellâ curuli sedentibus, fumare vetitum est. It was forbidden the tribunes to smoke while sitting on the curule chair. IV. Cavendum est ut fundum habeat, si vis sellâ fumare. If you wish to smoke in a chair see that it has a seat. V. Auricularіæ vj domum æstivam non fecerunt. Six earwigs don't make a summer-house. VI. Tam boni in mari continentur tubuli, quam illi e mari extracti. There are as good pipes in the sea as ever came out of it. Of these the fourth has been disputed on the ground that any one who sits down in a chair without a seat experiences a sensation of surprise; that surprise is akin to joy; that joy is akin to

happiness; that happiness is the object and end of our whole lives; therefore that he who sits down in a chair witdout a seat has attained the object and end of his whole life. To the fifth maxim Alciphron (known as "The Minute Philosopher") objects that the number of earwigs required in the composition of a summer-house is, as a matter of fact, $5\frac{3}{4}$; and he also denies the truth of the sixth maxim, since it is impossible for us to really ascertain whether the sea does not contain even better pipes than have come out of it, and he therefore advocates a wise suspension of judgment on this dubious and obscure question. It has also been opposed by the dogmatic Pipe Philosophers, who deny that pipes ever have come out of the sea, but this objection being founded on a false and misleading doctrine of experience does not merit a serious consideration.

And concerning these commonplaces or topics of place where enough, they being obvious and of little concern, but I would fain take notice of a disputable and disputed point—whether it should be lawful to smoke in churches. Now at the present this is not the case, and I doubt not that some may consider it profanity to even mention such a matter. But all this is on the assumption that smoking *is* profanity, which I will by no means allow, for I maintain, on the contrary, that it disposes the mind to attention, which must be either desirable or not desirable. If it is not desirable then it must be right to be inattentive in church (for what is not desirable is not right), but this is plainly not the case, and therefore it is desirable, and therefore right. Secondly, it may be said that the fumes would be disgusting to certain persons, but this objection assumes that whatever is disagreeable to some must be unlawful for all, but this is plainly not a fact; for if it were, since it is disagreeable to some persons to be sober, it would follow that we should be all drunkards, which is absurd. And again, granting that it would be disagreeable to some, and that therefore all should be debarred, what easier than to

have *smoking galleries*, by which all possible annoyance would be avoided? And thirdly, it may be said that smoking in churches is not customary, and therefore not right, in which it is assumed that whatever is not customary is not right. But if so it must have been right to burn heretics and schismatics, for it was very customary. Fourthly, it will be argued that what may be called the *associations* of smoking are of such a kind that though *per se* it is not profane, yet by its relations it has become so, and so should not be allowed. These opponents would talk of how "tinkers and beastly folk" do smoke, of the vile places they smoke in, and of the vile words that proceed out of their mouths as they smoke. But no one that I know of has condemned standing or sitting in church because vile people stand and sit in vile places, or singing in church because there are vile and filthy songs. So we perceive that all these objections against smoking in churches are but empty sophisms, possessing no real weight or validity. Yet many feeble folk are misled and confounded by them, and so it was my duty so thoroughly to expose and confute the same that no one upon reading this book should have it in his power to bring forward the excuse of ignorance.

And since some, on a study of the tree, may blame me for having omitted "smoking-carriages," I reply that these "smoking-carriages" are but rooms in motion. And if any one shall say that they are not rooms because they are in motion I tell him he is a dolt and an ass, who if kicked (as he would deserve to be) would deny the foot that kicked him to be a foot for the reason that it was in motion. I may say, however, that some have denied that smoking in anything which moves, whether carriage, boat, or ship, can reasonably be called smoking in any place whatever, since "mobile movetur nec in loco quo est, nec in loco quo non est"—that which is in motion moves neither in the place where it is nor in the place where it is not. (Here the word "loco" would tempt the fool to jest, and seeing that I forbear thou mayest conclude what thou pleasest, but

beware of an illicit process.) But since you must either smoke in the place where you are or in the place where you are not, and it is plain that you are not smoking in the place where you are not (for you are in the carriage, ship, or boat), therefore it is clear that you are smoking where you are. But yet, I allow, there is a certain difference between smoking in that which moves and that which moves not, so I will meet the objectors half-way and term such smoking smoking in space. But this again must be carefully distinguished from smoking in or out of a balloon (in air), for in this latter case your body is wholly disconnected from the earth, whereas the carriage rests upon wheels, the wheels upon rails, and the rails upon the earth.

Now as to the question whether it is good to smoke at games, I reply that in all games requiring an application of the mind it is good, as tending to increase the attention and application thereof. Such be chess-play, the philosopher's game, and all ouronomachies and metronomachies, together with games at cards and the like. But, on the other hand, I forbid smoking at tennis and all ball games in which a free play of the body and hands is required, as being likely to impede free action and lead to loss. Especially do I discountenance it in tennis-play, which of all games demandeth the most bodily action, and trust me he who smoketh at this game is little like to make a good chase or put the ball into the grille. But to those in the dedans who watch the sport it may well be allowed, and so for all games with regard to those who look on. And notably in bowls it is a pleasant thing, seated on a bench with a can of ale, to smoke a pipe and cry "Euge! Belle! Pessime!" as it may hap, so to partake in the delight and not the labour of the game. Yet beware of using a pipe of any new-fangled or curious shape, for thus the whole would be marred and become discordant, and like to ancient misereres cushioned with white satin. So the only pipe proper in such case is the churchwarden, and that a full yard in

length. Likewise let the tobacco be placed on a dish, and all will be harmonious and in accord.

But this digression into which I have wandered pertains rather to pipe poetry than Pipe Philosophy, and so I will not enlarge upon it. And for the same reason I do not enter into the innumerable digressions which are open to me concerning place, but leave them either to be writ or not to be writ as it may chance. Wherefore as to place, both where and where not, enough, and so to what follows.

CHAPTER IV.

Forasmuch as I have lately treated of place I will now treat of time, which for the smoker may be cut into three divisions—initiative, inchoative-contingent, and ultimate, of which technical terms the meaning is this: initiative has reference to the time (or age) at which a man may begin to smoke; inchoative-contingent to the time (or hours) at which he smokes after he hath begun; and ultimate to the time after which he smokes no more, whether by death (which is woeful) or by the compulsion of others (which is more woeful), his own deliberate choice (which is beyond comparison most woeful). But, you ask, do I say that stopping short by death is the least woeful of all? Yea, verily I do. For as in the case of a drunkard (who does evilly) it is good if he cease to drink by his own free-will, less good if he do so compelled by others, and least good if he be estopped by death; so in the case of a smoker (who does well) the very opposite is the case. For it is most melancholy when a man ceases to do well by his own infirmity of mind, less so when he ceases compelled by others (for there is a chance that he may free himself and do well again), and least of all when death finds him still persisting in his well-doing, and to be subdued by it alone. So the three above terms being made clear, we can proceed to a separate consideration thereof.

Firstly, initiative or absolute commencement. That is to say the smoking of the first pipe, the causes that lead to it, the manner of smoking it, and the events that result from it. And as to the causes that lead to it they usually commence with an idle curiosity excited by seeing others smoking, especially if he in whose mind there is this

curiosity be of tender years and he perceive certain of his own age (ἥλικες ἥβης) smoking in secret or openly, and *apparently* deriving gratification therefrom. Secondly, I assign as a cause original sin, disposing the mind to do what is forbidden. Especially is this the case in the schools, where smoking, being strictly forbidden, is much practised. Thirdly, I assign as a cause vanity or self-love, which represents that smoking promoteth a brave and manly appearance. All these acting together cause desire, the only counter to which is fear, arising naturally from the risk of stripes and the well-known vigour of tobacco in the unaccustomed stomach. But finally desire casts out fear, and the catechumen obtains possession of the fumificables in one of the four ways that we have before pointed out. And mostly it is by buying, this method affording the most pleasure. Next in secret (if he be fearful) or in the sight of witnesses (if he be vainglorious) is the very first pipe smoked, with all its rites of solemn illumination, placing between the lips, turning in the fingers, and the rest. At this point the casuists make an objection that properly there is, in fact, no such thing as a first pipe, inasmuch as the beginner's courage and stomach both fail him before half or a quarter of the tobacco in the pipe hath been smoked. Therefore, they maintaining that the term "primus tubulus," or first pipe, connotes the smoking of *all* the tobacco that may be in the aforesaid pipe, deny that such first pipe properly exists. To this I reply that primus tubulus doth by no means respond to their definition, but only denotes the first smoking of tobacco, were it but a single whiff, or even if a pipe be not used, but a cigar or cigarette. Secondly, it is by no means the fact that all beginners are sickened in the middle, for, if I remember rightly, I myself smoked my first pipe through without flinching, and dare say that many others have done likewise. But I admit that in most cases there cometh a horrid presentiment, with quaking of the flesh and a fearful pallor. Then all things, as it were, whirl round, the whole universe

appears a-wrack, and night descends upon the soul. Such terrors, indeed, does the wretched one endure that it is likely that he vows henceforth a lifelong abstinence and curseth the hour in which he bought this dreadful herb to be a torment both to his spirit and his flesh. All this if he be private, and no one but himself wotteth of it; how much more if he be discovered and perchance rewarded with stripes and disgrace! And to represent this chain of cause and effect more clearly I subjoin the following scheme *ad exemplar Dummerkopfii*, the which hath met with much approval at the hands of Pipe Philosophers;—



Of a verity this initiative demandeth "robur et aes triplex," and it might seem wonderful how, knowing all this, any one can have courage to begin. But the heart of man is a stubborn thing and not to be taken aback, so, in spite of all, the flame is ever kindled anew, and the race of smokers multiplieth exceedingly.

Now this state of sorrow and abasement continues not long, and "mox reficit rates," soon the beginner getteth new pipes to replace those which were broken, and new tobacco in the room of that which was consumed. So little by little, by slow degrees, he advanceth to cloudiness, fearing less with every pipe to be disturbed by sickness, and so at last becometh a smoker. But some there be (O infausti, miserabiles!) whose habit of body will never allow them to smoke, or at best only by whiffs and starts, by which little profit is to be got. Others are so confounded by the event of that first pipe that weeks become months and months years before they venture again and become in truth smokers. And Scriblerus Redivivus appears to me to discriminate very wisely between a smoker and one who smoketh, "for the first hath the habit of smoking, which the last hath not yet." And if it be asked at what age it is best to acquire the habit, I answer that generally the age of seventeen is the best, or thereabouts, but this must depend greatly on circumstances and habit of body, since it may be too early for some and too late for others.

Next, let us proceed to the inchoative-contingent, which presupposes the habitude of smoking, and has reference to the hours of the day or night at which it is most pleasant. to smoke. And as to this answer—at all hours—with certain necessary and obvious exceptions. Firstly, it is good to smoke one pipe, and only one, before breakfast, at which time the body being empty of food is most amenable to the nicotinic energy. Secondly, fail not to smoke three pipes at the least immediately after breakfast. And these should be performed in the open air, and, if it is possible, while

sauntering about a fair garden or pleasaunce, off which the dew has not yet gone, and odorous with the scents of flowers. Thirdly, in the afternoon smoke not less than three pipes, but not immediately after eating lest they breed heaviness and black choler. Fourthly, and lastly, in the evening, and far into the night, when hanging over your books, smoke as many pipes as possible, at the least not less than four. This I propound not as a maximum but a minimum, and necessary to be discharged by all. For any one who smokes less than eleven pipes per diem is not so much to be accounted a smoker as one who smoketh. And if at any time the student should feel his mouth to be, as it were, cloyed and brackish with much smoking, let him by all means pause for awhile, and drink a strong decoction of tea without either sugar or milk. For nothing is more recuperative and invigorant than this same black tea, and altogether a drink mightily to be commended. And thus in constant smoking and meditation passeth the life of the Pipe Philosopher. To him no place and no time are good save they give him liberty to smoke, and none ill save they take this liberty away. Although, by misfortune, he be compelled to battle with the world and earn his livelihood, yet it is but the body of the man that is so engaged, and his mind not at all. Wealth he only cares for as relieving him of this necessity, and enabling him to be more choice and curious in his fumificables. Opiparous fare and gentle living are held by him of no account, but rather as hindrances and stumbling-blocks to the spirit. Outward show, rich dress, and a fine appearance he dreams not of for himself, but delights to see them in others that he may on them vent his scorn. But most of all he despises that which men call love, and is wont, as we have seen, to look under a fair outside, and see the ruddy skin grow yellow and wrinkled, and at last, bursting asunder, disclose the grinning jaws, and holes for eyes, and layers of bone, about which, when they are covered over, there is such a pitiful to-do and exclamation. Thus, with much tobacco, many books, and a few

friends, his life goes on, till at last the inchoative-contingent draws to an end, and the ultimate begins.

And when it has come to this, and he knows that he has but a few pipes more to smoke in this world, he taketh care that they be smoked well and with a good grace, until it cometh to *ultimus tubulus*, the very last pipe, and dying as he hath lived, neither hoping, fearing, nor regretting, he departs hence, and becomes but a memory of a life well lived, and a death bravely endured. But if this is a woeful matter—*μείζων ἢ κατὰ δάκρυα*—what shall we say of the man who by his own choice leaves off to smoke, and takes to himself some ribbon as a proclamation of his shame? He shall be as an evil savour, a stink, and an abomination in the nostrils of the faithful, and as one not fit to be named as a man. And let those who have brought him unto this be accounted as lemures and larvæ, and their voices as the squeaking of the bats of hell. So shall they be emptied out like ashes, and the recollection of them be even as the foulness of a pipe that is foul, but with a more exceeding foulness, and their memory as the memory of a bucket that is broken. Wherefore let those to whom there is still time take heed and make use of that time, concerning which let such things have been said.

CHAPTER V.

In relation let us first take the eight predicaments or categories of fumifical mischance, as they are commonly given by the scholastic writers, and repeated in the Schools of Pipe Philosophy: (1) suffering in body, which befalls detected smokers of tender years; (2) without a pipe-light: (3) in a drawing-room, or in the company of females; (4) in a church, which, if my arguments take effect, will soon cease to be reckoned a predicament; (5) sick in body, whether by reason of tobacco or otherwise; (6) with a stopped-up pipe; (7) with a burnt tongue; (8) proctorised, the which is a predicament limited to our English Universities. These predicaments are below enumerated in some Latin lines, of no little elegance and numerosity, and well worthy of a place in the memory:—

"(1) Verbera cum dantur, (2) tubulo cum lumina desunt,
(3) Aut cum fœmineis œdibus usque manes.
(4) Aut in Divorum templis, (5) ægerve, (6) dedisti
Frustra operam tubulo, heus! inapertus abit.
(7) Cum patiens tristi cruciatur lingua dolore,
(8) Proctoribus titulum dicis et æque domum.
Hæc si perlexisse juvit, collecta magistris
Omnia fumantis prædicamenta tenes."

Of these eight predicaments the doctrine was first taught in the University of Padua by certain learned Greeks who had fled thither from Constantinople. And they continued to hold their place without assault, till at the end of the last century they were impugned oy the German Windiemann, who proposed to substitute the following:—Verberability, mulierity, ecclesiasticity, glossarity, and inillumination as being fewer in number, and possessing greater perspicuity. And Zimmerblast, in his "Kritik der Windiemannschen

Pfeiffe-Philosophie," *Tüb.*, 1815, would further reduce the predicaments to two only—inillumination and imperturbability, or hæccity, by which latter term he denotes that peculiar cohesion of matter inside a pipe which it is impossible, without the assistance of a steam-engine, to pierce through. But the publication of this tractate leading to a riot among the students, and the threatened deprivation of the professorial chair, Zimmerblast consented to withdraw these innovations, and to be content to leave matters as he found them, which, to a German philosopher, is accounted the utmost of humiliation. Yet since that time a new school hath arisen in the University of Paris which teaches that there is in reality but one predicament, which is "N'être pas Parisien"—not to have been born in Paris. For Paris, being the capital of France, is the seat of the French Republic, which is admitted by all to be the most tolerant, magnanimous, and amiable Government that ever has existed or ever can exist; and it being likewise granted that the Parisians are the most courageous people under the sun, and also the most polite (as was indeed most apparent but lately), it follows of necessity that the only real misfortune that can befall a man is not to have been born in Paris; and so but to mention this is sufficient, all other misfortunes being of but minor importance. Moncurius Scepticus, however, in his "Itinerarium per Orbem Terrarum factum," considers the real predicament to be "the not-possessing a house in Bedford Park," which being bounded on one side by an open sewer, on another by a brickfield, and at each end by a railway, cannot fail to be a desirable and pleasant spot. (Rents from £35 to £100. Apply at the office.) Some obstinate and misguided spirits, indeed, would object to this on the ground that two feet of water on the floor of one room and a delapsed ceiling on the table of another are, to say the least, inconveniences; but as Moncurius contends, is there not a club and a School of Art, and doth not the railway take men direct to that spot, hallowed by the delivery of so many *Orationes Notilocellenses*, or south-windy dis-

courses? And he who having read that notable discourse in which Moncurius completely, logically, and syllogistically proves the absurdity of the Christian religion* is yet inclined to doubt the blessedness of living in propinquity to so great a man, must be, in very deed and truth, nought but an ignoramus and blockhead. So that there is not a little to be said for this Moncurian predicament, but as it is but lately promulgated, I am constrained to adhere to the old predicament until such time as the world be dichotomised into—1. Wise men = Dwellers in Bedford Park. 2. Fools = Dwellers in other places.

To pass from the predicaments to other matters, I will first take the doctrine of tubular remembrance, or *anamnesis*, which, stated briefly, is as follows:—A pipe that has been smoked by any one, (1) in a certain place, (2) at a certain time, (3) in a certain relation, will, if laid by for a season and smoked again by the same person, (1) in another place, (2) at another time, (3) in a different relation, bring back to the soul an *anamnesis*, or remembrance of the former place, time, and relation. And this, not imperfectly as an outline, but perfectly as in a finished picture. Which in the *Fumifical Logic* of Peter Pfeiffe (Petrus Fistularius) stands thus:—"*Tubulus, ab aliquo fumatus; I° In loco quodam; II° In tempore quodam; III° In ratione quadam; si per temporis quoddam spatium deponatur, et inde rursus ab eodem. I° In alio loco; II° In alio tempore; III° In ratione diversâ, fumetur: in animum ejus perfectam, loci, temporis, rationis prioris memoriam reducet. Quod non indistincté, aut confusé, sed distincte et perspicue, perficit.*"

Such being the doctrine of anamnesis in the precision of the Latin tongue, for the benefit of those who love to see a

* Thus: "The Story of Alcestis has some faint resemblance to the Belief of Christians.
No one now believes in the Story of Alcestis.
Therefore, No one now believes in the Belief of Christians—or, if they do, they ought not to!" And yet there are still some few persons who fail to see anything absurd in Christianity!

dignified subject treated of in a dignified language, let us examine somewhat closely this ingenious and subtle opinion. And firstly it may be inquired, Is it in reality so? and if it be so, whether universally or particularly? To which questions I may make one answer, It is so, but not universally. For as a cucumber seed would attain to nothing if it were planted in ice, so neither can this process of anamnesis take place in a cold and unfruitful mind, but only in one that is delicate and readily receiveth and fructifieth whatever is cast upon it. And secondly, what is the cause of this recollection? Why, as to this various explications have been given. Some will have it that a pipe collects while it is being smoked certain *atoms* of a subtile æther, which in its turn is impregnated with the quintessence of the surrounding air, which differeth in some degree in every different place. And if the recollection includes a recollection of persons it is said that the *atoms* collected were partly composed of the breath of these persons. So these *atoms* being collected are stored up within the substance of the pipe, and remain within it for any length of time (but Spitsbubius will not allow a greater duration than a thousand years), and upon the pipe being smoked again are drawn out by the heat, and pass with the smoke into the body, and so act on the mind, not immediately but mediately. But this theory seeming somewhat gross and material was rejected by Limalaudulus de Tamesi, who maintains that the anamnesis is owing to the ideas of place, time, and relation being perceived by the "anima tubuli," or spirit of the pipe, and so becoming a part of it, whence after a certain mysterious fashion they pass directly into the mind when the pipe is again used. But the means by which this is effected he explains not, and so lays himself open in some way to the charge of obscurity which hath been brought against him. And if we admitted this hypothesis we could not fail to regard a pipe as *divinitatis specie quadam imbutus*, a kind of divinity capable of receiving and imparting ideas, independent of matter, which would seem

somewhat too extravagant. For my own part I do mostly incline to the opinions of Jacobulus de Corvis, who holds that a pipe is neither capable of receiving æthereal atoms or ideas, much less of storing them up and imparting them. And his explanation by instance is this:—Supposing that on a bitter and frosty day in midwinter I walk through a wild country abounding in hills, the tops of which are covered with snow. And let me also meet with certain of my acquaintance, and talk with them on some particular matter to which we alone are privy. Grant me likewise to fall into a ditch as I journey along, and be not wroth if I be covered with slush even to my doublet. And further when I reach my journey's end let it be not forbidden me to devour muffins (placentæ calefactæ) even till I can eat no more. Now all these events have occupied a certain space of time, during some part of which (say from my meeting with my friends till the falling into the ditch) I have smoked a particular pipe and none other. And a twelvemonth after, this pipe in the meantime not having been used by me, suppose that in the heart of a city, on a burning July day, I once more smoke it. And I have scarce put it to my lips when in imagination I am again among the snow-clad hills and feel again the cold keen air of winter. Next cometh to my mind the meeting with my acquaintance, the matter of our discourse, the wetness of the ditch, and the hotness of the muffins. Now it was only during a part of the whole time that I was actually smoking, so that neither by æthereal atoms or ideas could the pipe participate in what preceded and what followed my smoking of it. And the cause of recollection is as follows:—Every single pipe hath in it a somewhat that renders it different from other pipes. And this somewhat is perceived by the mind secretly—that is to say, it is not known by itself, but by what results from it. So taking this along with more material differences of substance, shape, colour, and the like, it is easy to understand that all these acting together recall to the mind when it was they were last perceived. Which being

accomplished, the mind, not content with the bare particulars of time, proceeds to place, relation, action, passion, and so on through the categories until the whole circumstances, with what preceded and what followed, are run over anew. So that the very slightest matter which occurred formerly is now remembered and pondered over, it may be even to a ridiculous and disproportionate extent. And this seems to be a very rational view to take of the matter, far more agreeable to the intellect than the former hypotheses I have cited. For if we allow that the ideas do actually exist in the pipe itself it must follow that they exist for all who may afterwards smoke it, and not alone for the original smoker. So we might suppose a new species of divination arising named *capnomancy*, in which by merely smoking a pipe we might gain a knowledge not only of the deeds or words of others but their very thoughts and desires, which would be an art greedily sought after and pursued, and, indeed, might have we know not what results. For since it is agreed that the superior produces the inferior, and since ideas are confessedly superior to matter, who shall say that ideas may not be so managed as to produce matter? So by continually brooding over the ideas—say of wealth—contained in a pipe the smoker might be surprised by one day seeing the ideas take visible form in the shape of gold, silver, and broad lands. But this hath not yet been accomplished, and as far as I can judge is not at present likely to be, which is much to be regretted and deplored.* And as to the atomic theory it is clear that it is not possible that, except during the very act of smoking, the atoms can influence the pipe at all, and since the most subtile part of the anamnesis is its comprehension of what preceded and what succeeded, this is left altogether unexplained, or only to be explained in an unnatural and improbable manner. So let the hypothesis of Jacobulus be adjudged the conqueror, and with this let us end the matter.

* But read more of this in Limalaudulus de Tamesi and Dummerkopfius.

Next, by way of disputation, I will take the statement often made by the thoughtless—smoking is a slow poison. First as to the form. What is a "poison?" A poison is a substance, either solid, liquid, or gaseous, which being absorbed into the system of the body either kills it or more or less grievously injures it. And a "slow poison" is therefore a substance which does this slowly and by degrees. From which it appears that "smoking" is a substance. But smoking is the *act* of inhaling smoke. Therefore an *act* is also a *substance*, which is absurd. For how can we talk of a solid *act*, or a liquid *act*, or a gaseous *act?* It might as justly, *quoad formam*, be said of dancing that "it is a slow poison," or of any other act of the body that can be conceived of. And again, what meaning are we to assign to the word "slow?" I will grant that "smoking" *is* a poison, and search among other poisons and endeavour to understand in what manner "slow" is applied to them. Now among rapid poisons we find, for example, aconite, prussic acid, and the venom of certain snakes. These will kill a man, it may be, in a second of time, it may be in two or three days at the most. And among slow poisons there are those mysterious powders formerly in fashion by which, at most in a few months, a man's strength was undermined and he seemed to fade away as if by natural disease. Now since "smoking" is a "slow" poison it is in the latter way that we should expect it to act, and a year of smoking at the utmost would be sufficient to insure death. But who ever heard of a smoker fading away after this manner? and even if it has happened so, how many out of the millions of men who have smoked have been thus caused to perish? Furthermore, can we say of any man who has attained the age of seventy, eighty, or ninety years, and who throughout (say fifty years) of his life has persisted in a certain habit, that he has been poisoned by that habit? Yet many who have died at such ages have been constant smokers for the greater part of their lives, and glory in having thus done. I grant that if a boy of twelve, without previous prepara-

tion, smoke eight ounces of tobacco in as many hours it is not unlikely he will die, or at any rate be grievously sick, but this amounts only to saying that "Tobacco, if it be used to an inordinate extent by one not used to it, will act as a poison," which might be said of well-nigh every substance we can think of as capable of being taken into the body. But yet *not* a *slow* poison, for the boy would probably die in a very short space of time, or be at death's-door for a day or two and then recover. So in no case can tobacco be said to be a *slow* poison, and only a *poison* when taken under exceptional surroundings. And, in fact, this argument, or rather statement (for an argument requires its terms to have a distinct meaning, and also a solid foundation), is mostly brought forward by those who

> "Compound for sins they are inclined to
> By damning those they have no mind to."

Such as are, for instance, your fine City dames, who will become well-nigh exanimate at the smell of good wholesome tobacco, but who, in the privity of their chambers, will stupefy themselves with chloral or morphia and the like. But it were waste of breath, better employed in smoking, to rebuke these malaperts, so I will leave them to their drugs, and betake me to my pipe.

This pernicious and hateful dogma being analysed into its elements of equivocation, folly, and alazonie, and so confuted, I will next observe the ten topics of doubt as propounded by Ænesidemus Minimus in his *Prior Fumifics* (Καπνόφορα Πρότερα). They refer actually to the lighting of pipes, but do strike indirectly at the certainty of all smoking whatsoever. For it being impossible to smoke tobacco before it be lighted, if it can be shown that considerable doubt attaches to the certainty of lighting, then it follows that an equal doubt attaches to the certainty of smoking. And this Ænesidemus endeavoured to prove. For being a professor at the famous University of Gotham, he grew dissatisfied with the empirical methods there in vogue, and

from his professorial tub enunciated the following sceptical propositions:—Supposing any one to have a pipe containing tobacco in one hand and a matchbox in the other, it is very improbable that this pipe will be lighted. For these reasons: 1. The tobacco may be damp. 2. The pipe may be too full. 3. The pipe may not be full enough. 4. The match may go out (*a*) of its own volition, (*b*) by the force of the wind, (*c*) by the foolishness of the agent. 5. The pipe may be undrawable, (*a*) because it is stopped up too much, (*b*) because it is not stopped up enough. 6. The intending smoker may become an idiot, or have a fit, and so be incapable of lighting the pipe. 7. If he be at school he may be interrupted by the archididascalus or one or more of the hypodidasculi. 8. He may change his mind. 9. There's many a slip 'twixt the pipe and the lip. 10. Supposing none of these things happen, and the matter be accomplished, yet it is false to say that the pipe has been lighted; for it is not lighted, but the tobacco that is in it. Which doctrines were no sooner made known than a storm of rage and indignation against Ænesidemus burst forth in Gotham, and not only was his tub of fumifical philosophy at once declared vacant, but its very bottom was knocked out by the students, by which it became yet more vacant, and wholly unfit for professorial purposes. Ænesidemus was further declared to be tainted with the worst errors of Gulielmus de Læto Lapide, the Pope, and the Caucus; and within a short space of time Gotham knew him no more, save as a Radical and a backslider, who had bitten the bosom that cherished him. And Gotham being a city of full five hundred souls, returning two Conservative members to the Commons' House, and possessing six churches and nine public pumps, besides innumerable private ones, it was universally thought in the town that this verdict would be decisive; but the country at large had lately experienced one of its occasional attacks of madness, and had placed Gulielmus de Læto Lapide at the head of the Government. And he, with that shameless wickedness for

which he is everywhere known, did show favour to Ænesidemus, and (it is vulgarly reported) did enter into a Corrupt Compact with him, and did give him golden money, on the condition that he should exercise his art of blacking boots for his (Gulielmus's) benefit. But all this, the disputations in the Commons' House upon the matter, the questions asked therein upon it, and the leading articles thereon, are they not written in the books of the misdeeds of Gulielmus de Læto Lapide, who made the people of England to go astray?

But if it be inquired by the curious what was the fate of the tub that was made vacant by the abominable heresies of Ænesidemus, and the boots of the students, I am able in some sort to answer. On every thirty-first of April (Old Style) this tub is borne round the town, vested in full academicals, and surrounded by a body of the graduates of the University of Gotham shouting discordantly the following verses:—

I.

"O! cives civitatis
Hujus clarissimæ,
Menoriam pravitatis
Æternam tenete.

II.

"Illius Professoris,
Qui ausit* dubitare;
Et est expulsus è foris,
Nec scio cur, nec quare.

III.

"Sed solum hoc scio,—
Qui audet dubitare,
Is expelletur Gothamo
Si absunt cur et quare."

So much for the history of these notable topics of doubt. But if we proceed to examine them critically, notwith-

* Hæc vox *ausit* prava Latinitas tibi esse videatur. Quod ego quoque putabam cum Gothami hoc carmen audiebam, itaque talia cantori cuidam dixi. "Minime" inquit, "nisi magis Catone censore censorius es."

standing the indignation that they aroused, I believe we shall find them more or less reasonable. Being for the most part expressed in clear and precise language, there appears to be no necessity of a particular explication. But I would advise the reader that in the fifth topic the words "not stopped up enough" denote what is usually named "leaking"—that is, an escape of air at some part of the pipe diverse from the bowl or mouthpiece. So considering that of these topics not one is impossible, and very many do frequently come to pass, it seems not unreasonable to argue for an *apathy*, or suspension of the judgment upon the question of certainty or non-certainty. I confess, however, that the tenth topic hath somewhat the appearance of a quibbling with words and of drawing too nice a distinction; yet we must understand that one of the most distinguishing marks of a true philosopher is a nicety in speech and a disposition to correct a loose and vulgar diction. So I will concede that these topics are well founded, and justify a wise suspension of judgment upon the matter of lighting pipes. Yet I can by no means consent with Ænesidemus when in his *Posterior Fumifics* he deduces from this improbability that it will be possible to light any given pipe the conclusion that, it being so uncertain a matter, it is better not to smoke at all. And when he proceeds, on these grounds, to recommend the taking of snuff and the chewing of quids as a substitute for smoking, I do not hesitate to pronounce him a gross materialist. For though he affirms that a quid contains the quidditas or whole essence of the Schoolmen, he seems to me but to equivocate and play the sophist, and I do therefore warn such of my readers as are inclined to materialism against these *Posterior Fumifics*, as being in some places little better than plain *acapnism*, and evidently contrary to the teaching of Pythagoras. And let all such would-be materialists remember that, though *metaphysically* the possibility of smoking may seem doubtful, yet to all *rational* intents and purposes it *is* possible, and may therefore be believed in and practised with

an easy conscience. And all doubters on this question I refer to the Καπνισμὰ Εντελεχέιας or Smoke-offering of Perfection by Proclus Capnobates, where shall be found much wholesome doctrine of a just mean between dogmatism and scepticism. Which observation applies equally to the downright acapnists, who deny all virtue whatsoever to tobacco, in whatsoever form it may be taken. For, they maintain, if there be any real savour in tobacco it must exist independently of the smoker, chewer, or snuffer, and be perceived in the same manner by all who use it. But what is more common than to hear two smokers of the same tobacco express directly contradictory judgments thereon? One will say it is mild, another strong, and if a third enter to them he will probably pronounce it neither mild nor strong, but of a medium flavour. Whence it is evident the virtue exists only in the mind of the smoker, and not at all in the tobacco itself. And who is ignorant that a single puff of tobacco-smoke appears a very different thing to an *aphis vastator* than to a man, inasmuch as to the insect it is death, but to the man a pleasure; but if the virtue really existed in the tobacco or the smoke from the tobacco it would be the same to the one as to the other. And again, you will hear the same man express different opinions at different times concerning the qualities of the very same tobacco; but if there existed any real savour in the tobacco itself this could not possibly be the case. So this nicotinic virtue is plainly a concept or notion of the mind, and in that manner really existing, but as it is vulgarly conceived to exist (namely, not in the mind, but in tobacco), it exists not at all. But these doctrines are so far harmless in that they do not advise the abjuration of smoking, but only regard it in a new and mysterious light, and so may be admired for their ingenuity without fear of any practical consequence. Yet they are to be condemned for obscurity and mistiness of expression, and are therefore not to be studied save by solid and profound doctors of Pipe Philosophy.

Such, in brief outline, are the two principal schools of

sceptics, the one headed by the sometime Professor of Gotham, and becoming degraded to the base materialism of snuffing and chewing, and the other diverging into a mystic idealism, or notional philosophy, which, albeit not nocent, is yet wanting in basis, and so not worthy of any high laudation. And now, since I have traced from its origin and dim dawnings this Disciplina Tabulata, or PIPE PHILOSOPHY, expounding, anatomising, and dividing it on my way, rendering plain things dark and dark things plain, I may declare with Naso, *Hoc opus exegi. Fessæ date serta carinæ. Contigimus portum, quo mihi cursus erat;* or with Tully, using less tropical adornment, *Adducta ad exitum quæstio est.* And so, most stubborn and undaunted reader, I bid thee farewell, wishing thee half as much pleasure in the reading as I have had in the writing, which in truth has not been a little.

OHE JAM SATIS EST, OHE LIBELLE
JAM PERVENIMUS USQUE AD UMBILICOS.

Printed by Jas. Wade, 18, Tavistock-street, Covent-garden, London.

MR. REDWAY'S PUBLICATIONS.

TOBACCO TALK AND SMOKERS' GOSSIP. An Amusing Miscellany of Fact and Anecdote relating to the Great Plant in all its Forms and Uses, including a Selection from Nicotian Literature. 1s.

ESSAY ON THE GENIUS OF GEORGE CRUIKSHANK. By W. M. THACKERAY. With Prefatory Note by W. E. CHURCH, and upwards of 40 Illustrations. 7s. 6d.

CONFESSIONS OF AN ENGLISH HACHISH-EATER. 1s.

JOHN LEECH, ARTIST AND HUMOURIST. A Biographical Sketch. By FRED. G. KITTON. 1s.

THE SCOPE AND CHARM OF ANTIQUARIAN STUDY. By JOHN BATTY, F.R.H.S. 1s.

COSMO DE' MEDICI, AND OTHER POEMS. By R. H. HORNE. 5s.

THE HANDBOOK OF PALMISTRY AND CHIROGNOMANCY. By ROSA BAUGHAN. With Plates. 2s. 6d.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SWINBURNE. A Bibliographical List, arranged in Chronological Order, of the Published Writings in Verse and Prose of Algernon Charles Swinburne (1857—1884). 6s.

THE VALLEY OF SOREK. A Novel. By GERTRUDE M. GEORGE. 2 Vols. 21s.

STUDIES OF SENSATION AND EVENT. Poems. By EBENEZER JONES. Edited by R. H. SHEPHERD, with Memoir by W. J. LINTON. 5s.

PHIZ (HABLOT K. BROWNE). A MEMOIR. By FRED. G. KITTON. With Plates and Woodcuts. 3s. 6d.

PHALLICISM, CELESTIAL AND TERRESTRIAL, its Connexion with the Rosicrucians and the Gnostics and its foundation in Buddhism. By HARGRAVE JENNINGS. 21s.

TAMERLANE AND OTHER POEMS. By EDGAR ALLAN POE. Edited by R. H. SHEPHERD. 15s.

GEORGE REDWAY, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

72